DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 231 HE 014 732

AUTHOR Boyd, William M., II
TITLE Black Undergraduates in Predominantly White Colleges, 1973-77: A Report on Three Nationwide Surveys.
INSTITUTION A Better Chance, Inc., Boston, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.; Rockefeller Bros. Fund, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 112p.
AVAILABLE FROM A Better Chance, Inc., 334 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Black Stereotypes; *Black Students; Black Teachers; College Desegregation; Educational Background; Educational Trends; Enrollment Trends; Family Income; Geographic Regions; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; National Surveys; *Parent Background; Private Colleges; *Racial Composition; Selective Admission; State Colleges; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; *Undergraduate Students; Whites

ABSTRACT

Developments and trends in the education of black undergraduates in predominantly white colleges from 1973 through 1977 were assessed by three national surveys. Almost 800 black undergraduates at a representative sample of 40 predominantly white, four-year colleges were interviewed during each survey. Attention was directed to academic performance, resegregation, student educational and socioeconomic background, finances, special admissions, level of satisfaction, and post-college plans. In 1973 the top three characteristics that black students considered important in their choice of college were: financial aid (53 percent), proximity to home (50 percent), and academic reputation (48 percent). By 1977 the pattern had changed: academic reputation (64 percent), financial aid (39 percent), and proximity to home (38 percent). The findings indicate that black students are an extremely diverse group both in backgrounds and attitudes. Analyses were conducted in relation to sex, the racial composition of high school, parents' income, parents' education, college selectivity, public versus private colleges, urban versus rural, and region. By 1977 there was a decreased tendency to view the black community as an inherently disadvantaged environment, and a sizable proportion of black undergraduates were considered traditional students rather than nontraditional students (i.e., educational preparation and socioeconomic background). The overwhelming majority of black students complained about levels of black enrollment and employment at their colleges. A bibliography and questionnaire are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212231

A Better Chance, Inc.

334 Boylston Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
617/536-5270

HE

BLACK UNDERGRADUATES IN PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGES 1973-1977:

A REPORT ON THREE NATIONWIDE SURVEYS

by

William M. Boyd, II
President
A Better Chance, Inc.

HE 011 732

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

December 1980

FOREWORD

The National Institute of Education (NIE) is committed to the support of research that will promote equity and the improvement of educational practice throughout the Nation. An important program to further that mission is Desegregation Studies which promotes research that can be used in the effective implementation of desegregation.

From its inception in 1975 until the present, the NIE Desegregation Studies staff has concentrated primarily on the desegregation of public elementary and secondary schools. That work is now expanding to address the myriad of issues related to the desegregation of higher education. It is, therefore, appropriate that the Institute should at this time publish William Boyd's report on the experience of Black undergraduates at predominantly white colleges, the result of a study supported by NIE.

Like segregated elementary and secondary schools, desegregated higher education institions have sometimes been viewed as "southern problems". Yet, both are very much national problems. Like the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools, successful desegregation of higher education depends on a national commitment and the application of knowledge to the achievement of institutional change.

We need to understand the processes that bring about genuine integration, and the structural changes necessary to make educational institutions healthy learning environments for racially diverse student bodies. To that end, NIE will persist in its effort to add to our knowledge of the desegregation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreward	ii
1) Introduction--Purpose and Methodology	1
2) National Trends	9
3) Comparisons of Subgroups of Students	20
4) Comparison of Subgroups of Institutions	31
5) Implications and Recommendations	59
6) Bibliography	69
7) Appendix	74
8) Regional Tables	91

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION
--PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY--

How much progress has been made in the last decade toward desegregated higher education? A decade ago the Kerner Commission presented a gloomy picture of race relations in America. Had it focused on higher education, it would have seen one of the most segregated sectors of the society. As John Egerton described it, "in its make-up and in its mindset it is like a jug of milk--rich, white and homogenized."[1] Since that time, however, higher education has begun to work free of that dubious distinction.

In 1967-68 predominantly black colleges enrolled the overwhelming majority of black undergraduates, and efforts to increase black enrollment at white colleges were moving with glacial speed. Five years later, so much momentum had been generated that predominantly white colleges enrolled the majority of black undergraduates, and most colleges had more than a token number of black students.

As blacks responded to new opportunities and appeared in sizeable numbers on previously segregated campuses, observers, most of them white, noted that blacks were different from whites. That observation expanded to speculation that blacks wanted to be different--in fact, really wanted to remain separated, were unable and/or unwilling to deal reasonably with the demands of competition with the majority, and were poorly prepared academically to take advantage of their new opportunities. Almost as quickly as the colleges recruited blacks, it became a widely accepted theory that separate societies were developing on campus bringing to the ivory tower the same kind of hostilities between blacks and whites which prevailed on the city streets. "Throughout the country, college campuses have become cauldrons of racial unrest, reflecting in miniature the black and white disharmony evident in the society at large."[2] This conflict, it was contended, had to undermine the academic experience of black and white students.

By 1977, however, it was clear that predominantly white colleges had not been racial disaster areas in the early 1970's and that they had made considerable, though not consistent or comprehensive, progress in the interim. According to a study of black undergraduates which began in 1972, most black students have made satisfactory adjustments to predominantly white colleges. The study shared the understanding of critics of the desegregation effort that the success of integration is measured not just by the numbers of minority persons placed on campus, but also by the quality and ultimate value of their experience. It

added statistically analyzed data to existing intuitive analyses. This study monitored several indicators of possible resegregation on campus; each was approximately one-half as prevalent in 1977 as in 1973. The study also revealed that the popular estimate of rampant separatism and other problems in the early 1970's greatly exaggerated reality. Even in 1973 it was not the case that a majority of black students were resegregated or in difficult straits academically.[3]

METHODOLOGY

The Educational Policy Center of A Better Chance, Inc.[4] conducted nationwide surveys in 1973, 1975, and again in 1977 with funding from The Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the National Institute of Education in addition to substantial amounts from its own pool of unrestricted funds. The stated purposes of the study were to describe developments and trends in the education of black undergraduates in predominantly white colleges and to assess whether any movement observed was in a positive or a negative direction. As planned, almost 800 black undergraduates at a representative sample of 40 predominantly white, four-year colleges were interviewed during each survey. As a result, a unique and important data base has been developed which permits analysis of trends and provides a foundation for necessary future investigations of various aspects of educational opportunities for blacks at the college level.

The study concentrated on a broad but by no means complete range of major areas which have concerned recent observers of the college scene. Those areas, in addition to academic performance and resegregation, were:

1) Educational and socioeconomic backgrounds of students
2) Special admissions
3) Finances
4) Levels of satisfaction
5) Post-college plans
6) Impact of certain institutional characteristics.

Examples of major areas of concern which are outside the scope of the study are:

1) Comparisons with predominantly black colleges
2) Analysis of various governmental programs
3) Evaluation of educational intervention programs such as Upward Bound
4) Predicting persistence, career patterns, etc.

Findings about subgroups of black students and institutions are of particular interest and utility as colleges and students try to match their talents and demands, so these subgroups have received a great deal of attention in this study. In many cases variations between subgroups illuminate situations which were obscured by the leveling effect of reporting national averages.

Stratified random sampling techniques were used to assure that the interviews conducted would provide a valid basis for generalizations. The appendix provides technical details about selection of colleges and respondents. It also contains the questionnaire which was used in 1977 so that the reader can see the exact wording of questions. The questionnaire was developed after a pilot study of students, faculty members, and administrators at six colleges across the country. It should be noted that a great deal of flexibility was built into the final questionnaire by allowing unanticipated responses throughout the interview. These responses were reviewed and coded when the questionnaires were returned. New response categories were added and reported where appropriate.

To gauge the reliability of the data obtained, several steps were taken. In all three surveys a random sample of respondents was contacted by telephone to verify that they had been interviewed. In 1975 and 1977 all cross tabulations were subjected to a chi square test of significance. And in 1977, several additional statistical tests (Cramer's V, Gamma, Pearson's R, etc.) were conducted. They corroborated the chi square results, which are referenced in selected tables and the appendix for those who are interested.

In addition, extensive consistency checks were done to determine whether responses to certain items corroborated responses to related items elsewhere in the questionnaire. For example, the group which said race was a dominant factor in its choice of friends and activities was checked on its responses to questions such as the proportion of free time spent with other blacks. On the academic side, the group which reported high grade averages was checked on its responses to questions like the quality of academic preparation for college. The conclusion reached after these reviews was that the data is indeed reliable and potentially rich for increasing understanding of the experiences of black undergraduates in predominantly white colleges, even though reliance on self-reported information does allow considerable potential for distortion.

One important difference between this report and those published at the completion of the first two stages is that

it is now possible to answer questions about trends. Comparisons of findings in 1973 and 1977, therefore, receive a great deal of attention in this report.

One unfortunate note must be added to this introduction. Plans to include a control group of white students in Stages II and III of the study were abandoned because of the scarcity of funds. As a result, questions about the degree of similarity between the experiences of black and white students in areas covered by this study cannot be answered through the findings of the study alone. The utility of a white control group is indicated in a study limited to four colleges in upstate New York. One of that study's most interesting findings was that 73 percent of white students but only 56 percent of blacks felt "evaluation of work by faculty is conducted in a fair manner."[5]

We can and do, however, make comparisons with the literature about black students in white colleges. One theme which underlies that literature can be summarized quickly. "Racial tensions, distrust, some fist fights and a near total segregation in all but classroom activities characterize the relationships between black and white students;.."[6] and "...'revolution by any means necessary' has been replaced by 'a grade by any means necessary-- except perhaps by studying.'"[7] In addition, a substantial number of observers and researchers has reached similar conclusions in articles with eye-catching titles like "An Endangered Species: Black Students at White Universities" and "Black Student Alienation: A Study."[8] In a 1973 study, "Black Students In Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities," the authors concluded that blacks on white campuses became increasingly more polarized and more hostile to the white environment.[9] In 1975 a similar conclusion about Brown University was reported in The New York Times with descriptive phrases such as "a pervasive social apartheid."[10] It should be noted that these somber statements rest on a limited data base or on no systematic data gathering at all.

A variation of the basic theme focuses on class differences among black students. People who take that position assert that blacks whose families have low incomes and/or low educational levels are the "endangered species" but that middle-class blacks do well.

The two most dramatic and widely publicized versions of this argument came from two black professors at Ivy League universities. Professors Kilson and Sowell received a great deal of attention even though their writings were openly anecdotal and totally lacking a foundation in solid research.

According to Kilson:

> unqualified or ill-suited black applicants have often been accepted at top-rank white colleges in order to broaden representation of what some admission officials call 'ghetto types...' The blacks most likely to succeed in the competition at top-rank colleges must be encouraged, and if most of them happen to be middle-class (which, after all, is the case for whites, too), then so be it.[11]

Or, in Sowell's words:

> One argument for taking less qualified black students over more qualified black students is that social conscience requires that help be concentrated on those who need help most. Sometimes this is accompanied by assertions that academically able black students come from 'middle class' backgrounds and 'will make it anyway'. . . The aim is not to cultivate the most fertile soil but to make the desert bloom.[12]

Whatever the admissions policies, the black members of the class which was beginning its sophomore year when Kilson wrote produced the following results: President of Crimson Key, Treasurer of class, Marshall of class (2), Harvard National Scholar (2), and member of Harvard Crimson news board.[13]

Variations on the theme that middle class students do much better were expressed by Epps, Hedegard, and Brown, Johnson, Pifer, and by Clark and Plotkin.[14] The conclusions of this group were based on research and were carefully qualified. This distinguished them from the sweeping statements of Professors Kilson and Sowell.

According to Kilson and other observers, the lower-class blacks brought with them an "all black behavioral paradigm" which had "a nearly disastrous impact on the academic achievement and intellectual growth of Negro students." He postulated a good-old-days era when blacks were dispersed "throughout the nooks and crannies of Harvard College" according to their individual choices and contrasted it with an era of enforced black solidarity and the division of "blacks and whites into mutually exclusive communities under the leadership of 'ghetto types' who 'failing to achieve an academic identity turn willynilly to separatist politics...establishing bizarre standards of 'blackness' (including drug culture and criminal acts)." Kilson's reaction was to call for an end to the "profoundly disorienting influence of this situation on talented Negro students."

Kilson and the more moderate exponents of a similar class-oriented viewpoint greatly oversimplified the situation. They conceived the campus of the 1970's as offering few choices to blacks and all of those choices as being unacceptable to blacks and whites.

This damned-if-you-do-and-damned-if-you-don't viewpoint is summarized and amended by Jewelle Taylor Gibbs in a chapter of Black/Brown/White Relations (Charles V. Willie, editor). As a result of her work at Stanford University, Ms. Gibbs found the traditional psychological paradigm for examining behavior of blacks in America inadequate. Historically, blacks were seen as adaptors to majority society with three alternative forms of behavior available to them:

1) Assimilate or move toward the oppressor.
2) Withdraw or move away from the oppressor.
3) Separate or move against the oppressor.

Ms. Gibbs adds to these alternatives a fourth: affirmation of identity while adapting to majority demands--the process undertaken by most young blacks. As she puts it, the students experience "movement with the dominant culture that involves an acceptance of one's ethnic identity while simultaneously relating to the relevant aspects of the dominant culture."

Her four-part framework is a useful one to adopt when considering ABC's findings. There is a decreasing tendency of students toward overt separation such as requests for separate facilities, exclusive consideration of race in establishing friendships, and enrollment in a black curriculum if one is offered. Students are, however, racially conscious and racially motivated in their attitudes and concerns. They recognize their similarities to other blacks, expect to influence the predominantly white environment around them, and are dissatisfied if they cannot. They have begun to shift their demands for change from personal to more general social and economic ones. This is the same pattern which has been accepted in other ethnic groups as they maintain their separate identities, contribute their unique points of view and skills, and work within the norms of the majority for the good of the larger society. St. Patrick's Day celebrations are not condemned as separatist, nor are the Irish neighborhoods in which they thrive. Why then are manifestations of black identity so exaggerated and deplored?

Questions also should be raised about the failure to see that much of the "out-blacking" or exaggerated ethnic identification was an attempt to cover a great deal of insecurity and uncertainty. As Napper put it in 1973:

> To have one's 'blackness' challenged today does not elicit the same defensive emotional response it did three years ago; nor will black students go to the same lengths to prove their 'blackness'. Yet students are still concerned about having their 'blackness' questioned. This concern tends to make them overly cautious about what they say or do until they receive (or feel they will receive) substantial feedback endorsing their act.[15]

One also should ask why phenomena such as "black tables" in the dining room, black organizations on campus and similar occurrences are seen as inventions of 1970s black militants rather than the continuation of an old adaptive pattern. As Allen Ballard notes in a chapter subtitled "The Black Question and White Higher Education, 1865-1970",

> Repeatedly throughout the literature one finds escapes from the psychological pressures of the white colleges...informal or formal black social groups organized on the white campuses in order to compensate black students for their almost total ostracism. It is not an accident that one of the first black fraternities, Alpha Phi Alpha, was formed at Cornell University in 1906. At institutions (with) sufficient numbers of blacks. . . a 'Negro corner' is conspicuous in the University dining halls and cafeterias.[16]

And, as Willie and McCord conclude, "Any group has the right to withdraw from active participation with others if withdrawal is the only available way group members can protect the integrity of their personhood against insult and assault."[17]

It will be apparent to every reader of this report that the process of mutual adjustment between black undergraduates and predominantly white institutions has been complex and not always steady. The findings here and in similar, regional studies do, however, indicate substantial progress.

For anyone who wants or needs to understand the patterns which have begun to emerge, this report is a unique resource. The perspective available through a national sample and a time frame covering five academic years simply is not available elsewhere. The report answers a great many questions which have been debated at great length during the past decade. It also indicates a number of areas where further research is likely to be fruitful. Although there are a lot of desirable ends which the study did not pursue, it adds a great deal to our store of knowledge about an extremely important subject.

Chapter 1: Notes

1) Egerton, 1969, p. 37.
2) Vontress, 1971, p. 28.
3) In 1969 when over 100 colleges "had racial troubles" separatism was an elusive entity according to John Egerton whose study of 100 public universities "presented no clear-cut instance where separate and autonomous programs or facilities were being demanded."
4) ABC is a national, nonprofit organization whose goal is to increase substantially the number of well educated minority people who will assume responsibility and leadership in American society. ABC has recruited more than 6,000 youngsters and placed them in excellent secondary schools (currently almost 150 schools participate). Most ABC alumni have attended highly selective colleges.
5) Willie and McCord, p. 58.
6) Johnson, New York Times, 1972.
7) Napper, 1973, p. 114.
8) See Ralston, 1974; and Claerbaut, 1978.
9) See Davis, Loeb, and Robinson, 1970.
10) See Wald, 1975.
11) See Kilson, 1973.
12) See Sowell, 1972.
13) See Evans, 1976.
14) See Epps, 1972; Hedegard and Brown, 1969; Johnson, 1975; Pifer, 1973; and Clark and Plotkin, 1963.
15) Napper, op cit., p. 117.
16) Ballard, 1973, p. 55.
17) Willie and McCord, op cit., p. 13.

CHAPTER 2 : NATIONAL TRENDS

This study has revealed which began to emerge during the 1970's. This chapter is devoted to setting forth those patterns for examination, and provides background to the more detailed analysis which will follow.

One important set of findings reflects and summarizes the evolution which has taken place. It involves college characteristics which black students considered important in their choice of a college. In 1973 the top three characteristics were: 1) financial aid (53 percent); 2) proximity to home (50 percent); and 3) academic reputation (48 percent). By 1977 the pattern had changed such that the top three characteristics were academic reputation (64 percent), financial aid (39 percent) and proximity to home (38 percent). The fact that academic reputation was considered by more students than any other factor is important, and the dramatic difference between the number mentioning academic reputation and the second ranking factor is noteworthy. The majority of black students clearly do recognize that the most important aspect of college is the educational opportunity involved, as well as that financial aid awards from comparable institutions tend to be quite similar.

As the findings on choice of college suggest, black students are an extremely diverse group both in backgrounds and attitudes. In examining the large amount of varied data presented here, that is a simple finding which must not be overlooked. Contrary tc widespread opinion that black students are quite similar to each other and different from white students, large majorities of black students cannot accurately be labeled with stereotypical terms such as: low-income; from a segregated secondary school; admitted through a special program; or getting a "free ride" through college.

One example of the diversity is the primary source of funds used by black students to finance their education (see Table II.1). During the 1970's slightly more than 40 percent of black students financed their college education primarily through scholarships; 21 percent relied on personal savings, wages, or veteran's benefits. Whatever their primary source of funds, many black students supplement it by working. Forty-four percent report that they currently are holding at least one job. In most cases, working represents a substantial commitment of time, with 16 percent working less than 10 hours per week; 18 percent, 11 to 20 hours per week; and nine percent working 21 hours or more per week. Carrying the extra burden of one or more jobs appears to be taken in stride by most black students. Seven percent, however, report that working has a negative impact on their college experience.

TABLE II.1: PRIMARY SOURCE OF FUNDS

	Percentage of Black Students*		
	1973	1975	1977
Family	20	20	21
Scholarship from college	29	32	31
Scholarship from other source	16	12	12
Loan from college	11	10	9
Loan from other source	9	6	4

Only a few general statements can be made about black students on the basis that they apply to two-thirds or more of those students. Most continue to be graduates of public high schools (87 percent) and are single (93 percent). Most (72 percent) attend college in their home area; three-quarters have not previously attended another college (which indicates that relatively few of the more than 50 percent of black students who start in community colleges manage to reach four-year colleges); 82 percent participate in some extracurricular activities; and 72 percent are generally satisfied with their college experience. Large majorities feel that more black students should be enrolled (78 percent) and that more black faculty members and administrators should be hired.

Not only are there few similarities among many black students, but those similarities (public school graduate, single, etc.) are true for white students as well. Further, many black and white undergraduates are quite similar in terms of background and previous experiences. In fact, a sizable proportion of black undergraduates fits better under the heading "traditional students" than under the heading "nontraditional students." These students have college-educated parents, middle- to upper-level family incomes, and solid academic preparation for college. This fact leads to an understanding of why college staff members who expect all black students to be nontraditional, have trouble interacting with these students.

Other indicators of diversity and of increasing similarity between black and white students should be noted. In 1973, 59 percent of black students came from families where neither parent had attended college, while only 16

* Tables throughout this report, are based on responses to surveys of populations totaling 785 (1973), 784 (1975) and 782 (1977). Tables omit response categories which were chosen by very small proportions of the students interviewed. As a result, the total of the numbers shown often is less than 100 percent.

percent came from families where both parents had attended. In 1977, the comparable proportions were 52 percent and 22 percent. Almost 50 percent more students in 1973 than in 1977 reported poor preparation, and the reverse was true for excellent preparation (see Table II.2). These are simultaneous moves away from negative stereotypes and toward standard college norms.

TABLE II.2: ACADEMIC PREPARATION

	1973	1977
Excellent	10	14
Good	38	42
Fair	29	32
Poor	23	12

Even in 1973 few colleges had a majority of their black students burdened with multiple disadvantages (inadequate preparation, poverty, "cultural deprivation," and the absence of college-educated persons in one's immediate family). Eighteen percent had a majority of black students who were special admissions and whose parents did not attend college. Eight percent had a majority of black students who were special admissions, whose parents had not attended college, and whose family income was under $10,000. And only two percent had a majority of black students who were special admissions, whose parents had not attended college, whose family income was under $10,000, and who were supporting themselves primarily by loans.

By 1977 there was a decreased tendency to view the black community as an inherently disadvantaged environment, and so to recruit students from it whose academic preparation and background were not adequate for a successful college experience. It is fair to say that a perception of black students on campus as a homogeneous and multiply disadvantaged group, is now based on stereotypes or mythology. In 1977 only six percent of colleges had a majority of black students who were special admissions and whose parents did not attend college. No college had a majority of black students with three or more of the following disadvantages: special admissions status, non-college educated parents, family income under $10,000, and loans as their primary source of funds.

One can easily see why this multiply disadvantaged profile is disappearing by looking at the experiences of black students at a college where the majority of black

students are special admissions whose parents did not attend college. In 1977, at the college in question (a large public institution in the Northeast) 100 percent of the black students were special admissions, and 79 percent were from families where neither parent attended college. Eighty-nine percent of those felt they had been victims of discrimination at college, and 84 percent participated in black organizations on campus. Only 37 percent achieved average grades of "B-" or better, but 63 percent reported apparently unrealistic plans to attend graduate school. As Ballard states: "To enroll a homogeneous group of underprepared students will almost certainly guarantee failure of the program."[1]

Background does not determine, but appears to influence strongly, the choice of major fields of interest. Black students continue to follow paths which traditionally have been open to them and which do not penalize them greatly for weaknesses in their preparation. They choose areas of study leading to careers which require personal experience, insight, and individual effort as well as traditional academic preparation. It is worth noting, however, that a noticeable amount of growth has occurred in both biological sciences and engineering and math. Table II.3 indicates the most popular majors as well as the amount of interest in several other areas.

TABLE II.3: COLLEGE MAJOR

	Percentage of Black Students		
	1973	1975	1977
Social Sciences	28	31	25
Business	15	15	22
Education	15	11	11
Biological Sciences	6	10	10
English	4	6	7
Engineering and Math	4	5	6
Physical Sciences	2	2	2
Black Studies	1	1	1

Career plans also have a traditional focus. One aspect of this is continuing heavy emphasis on graduate education as a possible technique for making education serve as the ever-elusive balance wheel that can place blacks on an equal footing with whites. In 1973 more than half of black college students aspired to graduate education either full time (45 percent) or along with work (10 percent). By

1977 those with plans to attend graduate school full time had decreased to 39 percent, and the number planning to attend part time had increased to 24 percent, for a total of 63 percent. The fact that the percentage planning to go part time more than doubled appears to be primarily a result of the increasing difficulty of financing a graduate education, as several major sources of funding (the Ford Foundation, Council on Legal Education Opportunity, etc.) were decreased or eliminated.

The pattern of specialization which is evident among black students generates concern when one considers projections of decreased job opportunities in fields such as education and the social sciences and increased job opportunities in scientific and technical fields such as engineering. In addition, this pattern suggests that educators who feel that the limited-option syndrome no longer is a problem should reexamine their conclusions. Black students are preparing to do more than "preach and teach" but still are not taking sufficient advantage of the entire range of options available. This in turn raises questions about the type of exposure to varied options and the type of guidance being offered to black students. Responses to ABC's survey demonstrate that this area merits considerable attention.

With appropriate reservations one can digest the findings of this study and produce a profile of a typical black student in a predominantly white college. This profile, based on characteristics shared by simple majorities of black students, must be expected not to apply to substantial minorities of the group (see Table II.4). Nevertheless, it may be useful.

The term traditional refers to a student who is "normal" college age, single, a graduate of an integrated public secondary school in the same region as the college attended, and admitted through the regular admissions process with good or excellent academic preparation. The traditional student is able to maintain an acceptable grade-point average without receiving special academic help, is planning to attend graduate school, and is participating in at least one extracurricular activity. The student is generally satisfied with the overall experience at the school, which is the first college he or she has attended.

The student is likely to be nontraditional in specific ways, only some of which may create problems. It is not necessarily a cause for concern that the student probably comes from a major metropolitan area (particularly since he or she is likely to be in a less selective college in an urban location, or is almost certain to complain about the scarcity of black faculty members and administrators, since proportions of blacks in those positions remain outrageously low.

TABLE II.4: STUDENT PROFILE 1977

Characteristic	Range of Frequency 50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80%+
17-22 years old				X
Single				X
From a large city/ metropolitan area		X		
Neither parent attended college	X			
Attended public secondary school				X
Attended predominantly white school		X		
Financial aid is primary source of funds for college			X	
College in same region as secondary school			X	
College is first one attended			X	
College is in urban location		X		
College is less selective		X		
Was regular admissions student			X	
Had excellent/good academic preparation	X			
Has "C+" to "B+" grade-point average		X		
Feels no need for special academic help		X		
Not considering leaving college		X		
Generally satisfied with college experience		X		
Spends most free time with other black students			X	
Feels white students are friendly	X			
Lives in interracial dorm	X			
Participates in at least one extracurricular activity				X
Is concerned about inaccessibility of faculty				X
Is concerned about percentage of black employment			X	
Is concerned about percentage of black employment by college				X
Plans to attend graduate school		X		

Other nontraditional characteristics are more likely to be causes for concern. They include the likelihood that the typical black student comes from a family in which neither parent attended college, and spends most of his time with other black students. According to our findings, however, there may be too much concern about these characteristics. Many first-generation college students adjust easily and successfully, and frequent association with other blacks is not always a sign of fear or hostility toward whites. In fact, the typical black student perceives white students as friendly.

In spite of sensational reports about demands for re-segregation on predominantly white campuses, the majority of black undergraduates have adjusted successfully to de-segregation. In 1973 six out of ten students chose their friends and activities without making race a primary concern. Forty-one percent of black undergraduates indicated then that race was the dominant factor in their choice of friends and activities. By 1977 only 20 percent felt that race dictated those choices. This change of attitude was corroborated by an increase from 25 percent to 41 percent in the number of students participating in general extra-curricular activities such as college choirs, clubs, newspapers, and radio stations. Clark and Plotkin found two-thirds of students active in extracurricular activities,[2] while Willie and McCord found about half to be active.[3] If all organized extracurricular activities are included, our results for 1973 showed that 75 percent were active and that for 1977, 81 percent were active.

The indicator of separatist feelings which received a great amount of attention because of the sensationalism with which the news media treated it was preference for all-black housing. In 1969-70, at the high water mark of this sentiment, Willie and McCord found 28 percent of black students calling for a separate dorm.[4] In 1973, 15 percent of black students shared that preference. By 1977, less than half as many (six percent) wanted all-black living arrangements.

A less discussed but critical indicator of black student alienation is the degree to which black students feel that faculty members at their colleges discriminate against them. While in 1973, 40 percent of black undergraduates felt they had been victims of this type of discrimination, only 22 percent felt that way in 1977.

The most important academic indicator of black separatism perceived in the early 1970's was the alleged stampede of large numbers of black students into a separate curriculum made possible by newly created Black Studies departments. In fact, only one percent of black undergraduates

were majoring in Black Studies in 1973, and less than one percent reported that major in 1977. The same pattern was cited in The Chronicle of Higher Education where 165 of the 607,819 students who took the SAT in 1974-75 said they intended to major in black studies.[5] The other 99 percent of blacks have chosen majors throughout the traditional curricula of predominantly white colleges. Bayer found a similar pattern in the projected majors of freshmen entering college in 1972.[6] From 1973 to 1977 interest in the social sciences remained relatively constant (25-30 percent). At the same time business-related majors became more popular (15 percent in 1973 and 22 percent in 1977).

The attitudes of black students in predominantly white colleges and the experiences which help shape those attitudes have evolved dramatically in a short time. In more ways than not, black students appear to feel a part of the mainstream of college life. How have colleges succeeded in one decade in moving quickly both toward equal opportunity and toward one society rather than two on campus?

One hypothesis is that colleges now are working with more middle-class black students who "fit in" easily. There was a rise in the socioeconomic status of black college students between 1973 and 1977, but it does not appear substantial enough to explain the dramatic improvement, even if one believes that middle-class blacks adjust better. The majority of respondents in both 1973 and 1977 came from families in which neither parent had attended college. The percentage was larger in 1973 (59 percent versus 52 percent in 1977) but only slightly. In earlier studies the percentages were higher. Willie and McCord found 67 percent in 1969-70. Many fewer students in 1977 (30 percent versus 54 percent in 1973) came from families with incomes under $10,000, but adjusting incomes for inflation would close that gap considerably. In addition, 79 percent of students in 1977 received the majority of their funds for college from a source outside their families.

Therefore, two other factors should be considered. One is the substantial improvement in the ability of colleges to enroll students whose strengths, preparation, and interests match the differing demands and emphasis of the colleges. In fact one-half as many students in 1977 (12 percent) as in 1973 (23 percent) reported that their academic preparation for college had been poor. There was a dramatic decline in the number of students admitted under special programs to recruit black students, who differed in significant ways, usually in academic achievement, from the profile of successful students at a given university. Between 1975 and 1977 these admissions dropped from 47 percent to 21 percent in less-selective colleges, and from 31

percent to 22 percent in highly selective colleges. In addition, almost twice as many black students had average grades averages of B- or higher in 1977 as in 1973 (44 percent versus 26 percent) or in Willie and McCord's 1970 sample (23 percent).[8]

A second important consideration is that a little over one-third of the students (approximately 34 percent) enrolled in predominantly white colleges in 1977 had attended integrated (predominantly white) secondary schools. The experience with interracial exchange gained prior to entering college would be expected to facilitate adjustment to the college situation, and apparently it does. Moreover, students from predominantly white secondary schools felt their academic preparation was better than those from predominantly black schools. Sixty-eight percent from integrated schools versus 37 percent from predominantly black schools said their preparation was good or excellent. If efforts to expand desegregation of elementary and secondary schools continue, therefore, there should be indirect benefits in the adjustment of black undergraduates to college.

Some problems do remain and will require persistent, even escalated, efforts before they are resolved and predominantly white colleges can become genuinely multi-racial institutions. Even in colleges which have high percentages of black students, very few members of the faculty or administration are black. This disturbs black students more as time passes and as they increasingly identify with the colleges they attend. Sixty percent found this absence to be a negative characteristic of their colleges in 1973, while 83 percent complained about it in 1977.

College campuses are, therefore, similar to the rest of American society in one essential way. Their response to the challenge of the Kerner Commission remains incomplete. If higher education does not finish its journey toward one society, it will not be the fault of black students; the search for explanations will have to be conducted among white staff members and students. Clearly, this generation of black students does not want two societies any more than previous generations wanted slavery or Jim Crow. One reason that initial integration of colleges occurred so quickly was that blacks in great numbers wanted the same education available to whites. And yet, most of the top white colleges are experiencing substantial declines in black applications and enrollments even though they have adequate financial-aid funds.

In this context it should be noted that two-year colleges rather than four-year black colleges are the main recipients of expanded numbers of black applicants. Although

community colleges usually lack appropriate academic environments for students of high ability, they often have what predominantly white four-year colleges lack: black presidents, high percentages of black staff members, high black enrollments, and a reputation for being affordable and hospitable.

Whatever the reason or reasons for a decline in black applications to predominantly white four-year colleges, the findings of this study suggest several ways that progress toward desegregated higher education could be accelerated. These are discussed in detail in the final chapter.

The study's findings do indicate that in some critical areas no substantial progress was made during the second five years of efforts to desegregate higher education. Findings of this study show that black students' negative feelings in three critical areas remained constant or increased from 1973 to 1977. First, the group of black students reporting little or no contact with faculty members outside class grew from 40 percent in 1973 to 47 percent in 1977. If colleges were doing all they could to help black students maximize the value of their college experiences, and if black students were pursuing the same goal, it is doubtful that one-half of all black students would be isolated from supplementary contact with faculty members. Second, overwhelming majorities of black students complained about levels of black enrollment and black employment at their colleges. Eight out of ten students said that those areas were negative characteristics of their colleges in 1977, while only six out of ten had found them objectionable in 1973. The students apparently agreed with widespread sentiment that more substantial progress should have been made during the past five years. Third, and in many ways most distressing, is the fact that half of all black students continued to be victims of racial discrimination at their colleges. Certainly, some progress could have been expected in this important area at the end of the first decade during which blacks were "welcomed" at predominantly white institutions.

In light of these findings and the Bakke decision, it could even be argued that there has been a dramatic downturn in progress toward desegregation of American higher education. There are, however, hopeful signs that there has been an upswing due to the combined impact of response to decreasing minority enrollments, to backlash against pro-Bakke sentiment, and to projections of decreasing numbers of white students to fill college classes. At least it can be noted that in 1978, for the first time in several years, many colleges began a thorough reexamination of their interactions with black students.

Colleges have approached integration with a working concept of a hierarchy of needs. They brought in the "first" blacks to prove the liberal contention that a black individual could succeed in a white academic environment. Years later colleges responded to the call for integration with somewhat larger numbers of blacks. Facilities and programs were developed when demands of black students created the need. Reflecting satisfaction of some levels of their own hierarchy of needs, blacks have begun in numbers to express the need for more minority students, black faculty members, and black administrators in order to have a greater role in the actual planning and implementation of the educational process. Perhaps the reexamination by colleges of their efforts toward truly integrated education would reveal that responding to crises as they arise is not the best way to develop effective programs. Proposals for any other new programs on campus would have to include long-range plans to meet projected needs which would result from the implementation of those programs.

Peterson et al. describe the initiation of campus integration efforts, such as fund drives and hiring minority staff:

> But no serious assessment of human, physical, or financial resources needs for this new direction was attempted. This is not surprising, for the late '60s was not a time when serious planning efforts were undertaken...[9]

With serious effort the 1980's can be characterized by intelligent and effective planning for minority education as well as for other efforts of the college community.

Chapter II Notes

1) Ballard, 1973, p. 96
2) Clark and Plotkin, 1963, p. 56
3) Ibid., p. 10, and Willie and McCord, p. 20
4) Willie and McCord, p. 29
5) The Chronicle of Higher Education, 9/15/75
6) Bayer, 1972.
7) Willie and McCord, 1972, p.XXIII.
8) Ibid.
9) Peterson et al., 1978, p. 145

CHAPTER 3 : COMPARISONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS

In attempting to analyze the patterns which have been described earlier in this report it is helpful to examine groups of students which share certain characteristics or attitudes. The groupings which have been selected for inclusion here are based on four demographic characteristics (racial composition of high school, parents' income, parents' education, and sex) and two attitudes (satisfaction and plans after graduation). Each one of the groupings reveals important information which was not apparent in looking at the aggregated data.

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF HIGH SCHOOLS

Are integrated secondary schools better places to prepare for college than institutions with predominantly minority enrollment? According to the findings of this study, integrated schools are superior in academic terms but are not particularly influential in determining students' attitudes and reactions to college. Both findings probably can be explained by the fact that three-quarters of students who attended secondary schools with less than 25 percent black enrollment were in public schools. With a few notable exceptions such schools with heavy black enrollment have tended to have poorer facilities and inferior teachers, so the learning environment often is better in predominantly white schools. The social environment is a different story. Since the students arrive at predominantly white schools, in many cases as a result of court orders or in other strained circumstances, their interactions with white students often produce ambivalence or negative reactions which carry over to college. At the same time, those attending predominantly black schools certainly perceive the racism which has divided society.

Evidence that the learning environment is better in schools with less than 25 percent black enrollment is strong in this study. Graduates of those schools are almost twice as likely as graduates of schools with more than 75 percent black enrollment to have had excellent or good academic preparation (68 percent versus 37 percent). They also are more likely to have high grade averages and to be planning to attend graduate school.

The socioeconomic backgrounds of students from secondary schools which were less than 25 percent black also are somewhat distinctive. A majority (51 percent) of them have family incomes of $15,000 or more, while only one-third of

students from secondary schools with more than 75 percent black enrollment have such incomes. This is partially explained by the fact that one-quarter of college students from well integrated secondary schools had been enrolled in private schools.

In spite of the differences in background and academic preparation noted above, students from secondary schools with various levels of black enrollment are quite similar in attitudes and reactions to college. No substantial gaps separate the subgroups of students in terms of the amount of influence of race in their choice of friends and activities, housing preferences, their experiences with racial discrimination at college, or their feelings about negative characteristics of their colleges.

PARENTS' INCOME

The findings of this study about the impact of income are quite consistent from 1973 to 1977 and quite compatible with stereotypes in most cases. They confirm the common sense observation that students from families with higher incomes do tend to be advantaged relative to those from lower-income families.

Before elaborating on the expected, it is worthwhile to note a few unexpected findings. The first is that the highest income category has the lowest concentration of students who feel race has little influence on their choice of friends and activities (36 percent in 1977). They are not apparently more highly assimilated than lower income students.

Their rate of dissatisfaction with college also is high. From 1973 to 1977 dissatisfaction among students in the lowest income category was halved, but it remained constant for students in the highest income category. It, therefore, seems clear that admissions strategies designed to minimize discontent by emphasizing admission of more middle-class blacks were misguided. There are many good reasons for seeking more middle-income blacks as students, but assuming that they will be happier than other blacks is not one of them.

On the other hand, higher income is associated with most characteristics with which one would expect to find it linked. Nine times as many students in the more-than-$25,000 subgroup as in the less-than-$5,000 subgroup have two college-educated parents. The more-than-$25,000 subgroup, in fact, is the only one where a majority of students (55 percent) have two college-educated parents; no other subgroup has as many as one-third with two college-educated parents. Three times as many in the top income

category as in the bottom income category attended private secondary schools. Two and three quarters as many perceive their academic preparation for college as excellent. Two and a half times as many attended secondary schools where the black enrollment was less than 25 percent. Half as many were admitted under special programs. Only the more-than-$25,000 subgroup has a majority (56 percent) enrolled in highly selective colleges, while the proportion in lower-income categories is approximately one-third. Is it surprising, then, that four times as many in the top-income subgroup obtained grades of "B+" or better?

These dramatic contrasts are somewhat misleading, however, and overreaction to them could be dangerous. For example, the number of students obtaining grades of "B+" or better is very small (seven percent), and there is not much difference between higher- and lower-income students in the "B" and "B-" categories, where many students are found. Forty-six percent of students in the more-than-$25,000 subgroup are at the "B"/"B-" level, while 37 percent of students in the less-than-$5,000 subgroup also are at that level.

Another indicator of the limited effect of incomes on academic achievement, is plans about graduate school. Sixty-eight percent of students in the top income category, and 59 percent of those in the lowest income category plan to attend graduate school.

Furthermore, the prevalence of need-based financial aid has reduced differentiation even in financial areas. Naturally, many more students in the upper income categories receive their primary source of financial support from their families, and many more in the lower income categories receive it from scholarships. This does not mean, however, that those with family financial support suffer less anxiety about having sufficient resources to complete college. Approximately 20 percent of students in all categories worry about finances, with 22 percent in the lowest category and 17 percent in the highest category carrying that extra burden. There is almost no difference among student categories in the proportion of individuals who alleviate their concerns about money by working while in college.

What does all this mean about the effect of income on college experience? A family income of more than $25,000 increases the likelihood of a student's receiving good secondary school preparation and attending a highly selective college in anticipation of graduate school. As might be expected, this income does not remove the burden of concern about the cost of that education. In addition, the income and the background it provides can reinforce or create in

college a concern about ethnic identity because of vulnerability to the challenge of "not really being black." This could lead to the high rates of participation in black student organizations and the sizable influence of race on selection of friends which were observed in the group.

Why are students from relatively high-income families with good secondary school preparation behind them no more likely than their poorer, less well-prepared classmates to be satisfied with the college experience? Is there a percentage of the black population that cannot be satisfied in predominantly white institutions? Is that proportion any larger than it is among white students?

Does the educational background of well-off black students simply heighten their awareness of unsolved problems or do students' personal aspirations and expectations of their colleges rise with income and college preparation, thus eliminating the probability of attaining genuine satisfaction? Are the students affected by the fact that most of their experiences suffer by comparison to (a perhaps romanticized version of) their parents' experiences?

The answers to most of these questions appear to be affirmative. Without a comparative study, the situation of white students cannot be determined. A separate follow-up study of specific colleges which institute programs to respond to black students' needs would be necessary to test the ability of predominantly white institutions to reduce dissatisfaction effectively. A comparative study with black colleges also could enlighten speculations about the degree of inherent dissatisfaction and the independent effect of income on achievement.

PARENTS' EDUCATION

As income rises so does the probability that there will be one or more college-educated parents in a black student's family. Sixty-two percent of families with one or two college-educated parents had incomes over $15,000, while only 24 percent of families where neither parent attended college reached the $15,000 income level.

First-generation students (those without a college-educated parent) are not dramatically different from other black students in most aspects of their college experiences. They choose essentially the same majors, extracurricular activities, and housing. Race is a dominant consideration in their choice of friends and activities to approximately the same extent that it is for other black students. Even in the critical area of racial discrimination--particularly where faculty members are identified as the source--the differences between first-generation students and others are minor.

Some of the stereotypes about first-generation students are, however, supported by the findings of this study. The proportion of first-generation students who had excellent academic preparation (nine percent) is less than half the size of the proportion for other students (20 percent). Similarly, fewer than half as many first-generation students attended private secondary schools (seven percent versus 18 percent). These are important variables with a considerable link to each other and a positive association with student success. Students who attended private secondary schools most often report excellent preparation and do well at college.

The disadvantage in academic preparation of first-generation students is reflected in their choice of majors. Three times as many students who have college-educated parents as first-generation students choose biological science and physical science majors. Also, more students from famliies with college-educated parents plan to attend graduate school; three times as many plan to attend medical school. The proportion of first-generation students attending highly selective colleges is almost half the size of the proportion of other students. To amplify the distinction even more, it is important to note that almost half of the students with college-educated parents enrolled at highly selective colleges. This gives added significance to the fact that students with college-educated parents obtain better grade averages than do first-generation students. Fifty-two percent of the former group, but only 42 percent of the latter, have "B-" or better grade averages.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the variations among subgroups of students with regard to academic matters (achievement, etc.) tended to grow between 1973 and 1977. For example, there was not much difference in 1973 between first-generation students and others in terms of proportions with fair or poor academic preparation. Fifty-six percent of first-generation students and 49 percent of the others were in the fair or poor categories. By 1977, however, a majority of first-generation students (51 percent) remained in the fair or poor categories, but only 36 percent of the other students had received fair or poor academic preparation. The growing gap is reflected in grade averages of the two groups, which were virtually identical in 1973 (25 percent versus 26 percent with "B-" or better) but which had become differentiated by 1977 (52 percent versus 42 percent). The pattern also is evident in plans to attend graduate school full time, which were nearly identical in 1973 (42 percent versus 46 percent). By 1973 significantly fewer first-generation students were planning to attend graduate school full time (32 percent versus 47 percent).

This recent trend advances the theory that secondary school preparation is a crucial, perhaps the most significant, variable. Second-generation students, who by definition here represent most of the upper-income families, did not greatly out-perform their less advantaged counterparts when integration efforts first expanded significantly in education. After several years of simultaneous integration of private and quality public secondary schools by proportionally large numbers of upper-income blacks with college-educated parents, the gap in performance between first- and second-generation students is widening.

These findings suggest a trend which has been much discussed recently: the emergence of a black middle-class which is substantially more advantaged than other blacks. Based on the pattern observed here, the differences between these groups can be expected to continue to increase as the middle-class blacks obtain better educations which, in turn, produce better career outcomes. There is little support here, however, for the idea that the attitudes of the two groups differ substantially or are antithetical. Both groups are extraordinarily similar in feelings on sensitive topics such as the ability of black students to influence college policy, changes desired to improve the experiences of black students, negative characteristics of their colleges, and the friendliness of white students.

How long it will take for the development of truly distinctive attitudes along class lines can only be a matter for speculation at this time. Apparently the seeds are being planted, but a great deal of similarity remains in the experiences of all American blacks, and the influence of this countervailing force to antagonism between classes may prove both strong and enduring.

There certainly is a tendency toward the development of class distinctions. It is true for blacks, just as it is for whites, that a good private secondary school education most often results in excellent academic preparation, which produces good college grades and probable consideration of graduate school. It is true that more students whose parents attended college attend these secondary schools. It also is true that college education is positively associated with income. Responses to the questions regarding choice of friends, perception of discrimination, and membership in black student groups indicate, however, resistance to class-based attitudinal distinctions. It seems that, for the time being at least, racial identification is stronger than class distinctions based on factors other than race, and that academically advantaged blacks make a particular effort to affirm their racial connection as they expand their personal perspectives. This contrasts

with projections and observations about the salience of being a middle class black upon arrival at college. Perhaps people making those comments and conclusions have forgotten the basic point made by Clark and Plotkin which is that all blacks who finish college will be middle class while none who fail are likely to achieve that status.[1]

SEX

A black student's sex is not a particularly important factor in influencing his/her experience at a predominantly white college. In 1973 only in a few areas did attitudes of male and female students differ significantly. By 1977 the number and magnitude of differences between those students was even less. With a few exceptions, which will be noted below, black males and females have virtually identical experiences in predominantly white colleges.

Black females continue to be more likely to come from families with incomes over $15,000 (47 percent versus 37 percent of males). In 1973 black females were more likely to be well prepared academically (54 percent with excellent or good preparation versus 44 percent of males). They no longer had better academic preparation in 1977, however, and had the same profile as males through all categories of preparation from excellent to poor. (Nevertheless, black female students in 1977 were slightly more likely than males to have high grade averages (50 percent "B-" and better versus 44 percent). Females also maintained a slight edge in terms of plans to attend graduate school (67 percent versus 60 percent of males).

One significant area of difference between male and female students involves the type of discrimination experienced at college. In both 1973 and 1977 females were more likely to cite faculty members as the source of discrimination. In both years the gap between the two subgroups of students in this area was identical. Most perplexing, however, is the fact that 51 percent of males, but only 39 percent of females experience discrimination on campus. Can it be true, as so many observers have asserted, that white society has a more difficult time dealing with black males than with black females? Another area of difference between the sexes was major field of study, where certain traditionally "male and female choices" prevailed. The male group majoring in engineering and math was three times the size of the female group in 1977 (nine percent versus three percent). Similarly, males were almost twice as well represented in business majors as were females (28 percent versus 17 percent). Females, on the other hand, were more than twice as well represented in education majors (15 percent versus six percent of males) and were more attracted to biological science majors (11 percent versus eight percent of males).

The important questions to ask here do not seem to be about differences between men and women, although the very real question about the treatment of the two groups by the majority remains. It is significant to note the movement by both black men and black women toward business majors. This is not a field for political radicals or, generally speaking, for separatists. Is the fact that business overtook education as the most frequently selected major a result of better counseling at the secondary level or perception by students that segregation in the business community is decreasing? Continuation of this study of related research will be necessary to determine whether these trends will persist during the 1980's.

SATISFACTION

The findings of this study indicate that a majority of black undergraduates are satisfied with their overall college experiences. There also is a clear pattern-- consistent from 1973 through to 1977--of factors associated with extremes of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Those factors are primarily social rather than academic. More specifically, the key factors involve race relations and related problems. Students who were somewhat satisfied are not considered in this analysis. There was no "somewhat dissatisfied" category offered.

A large majority of dissatisfied students share several attitudes. An unusually large number of them (85 percent) feel that their colleges are unresponsive to the needs of black students. On the other hand, less than half the very satisfied students (47 percent) share that feeling. Seventy-nine percent of dissatisfied students want to see more recruitment of blacks, but only 59 percent of very satisfied students agree. Similarily, 65 percent of dissatisfied students compared to 41 percent of very satisfied students want their colleges to provide more black activities. Finally, 65 percent of dissatisfied students (versus 34 percent of very satisfied students) feel that they have been victims of racial discrimination at college.

In attributing cause to feelings of dissatisfaction, it would be wise to note the remarkably positive attitude of many black students. The very satisfied group remains pleased with the college experience in spite of the fact that 47 percent find their colleges unresponsive, 59 percent perceive under-representation of blacks in the student body, 41 percent see the need for additional activities to meet their needs, and 34 percent feel they have been discriminated against. When large numbers of the satisfied students identify these problems, colleges need to address them as very real concerns of their black students.

One other attitude which is shared by a majority of dissatisfied students should be noted. Fifty-one percent of them (versus 29 percent of very satisfied students) feel there should be more financial aid for black students. In addition, three times as many dissatisfied students (28 percent versus nine percent of very satisfied students) are worried about having enough money to finance the remainder of their education. These findings should be considered in light of the fact that 58 percent of very satisfied students, but only 37 percent of dissatisfied students, have scholarships as their primary source of funds for college. Only eight percent of very satisfied students, but 18 percent of dissatisfied students, have loans as their primary source of funds. Finally, dissatisfied students have slightly larger representation of families with incomes over $25,000 (22 percent versus 17 percent of very satisfied students) but twice as large a proportion of students for whom the family is the primary source of funds (23 percent versus 12 percent).

Several additional factors appear important in producing dissatisfied students, even though they are not cited by a majority of very satisfied or dissatisfied students. Nine times more dissatisfied students than very satisfied students (38 percent versus four percent) identify inaccessibility of faculty members and administrators as a negative characteristic of their colleges. More than three times as many dissatisfied students as very satisfied students (41 percent versus 12 percent) identify supportive services as a negative characteristic of their colleges. Finally, 10 times as many dissatisfied as very satisfied students (39 percent versus four percent) identify the kind of place where their colleges are located as a negative characteristic.

Seventy-nine percent of the satisfied students (versus 44 percent of dissatisfied students) feel that white students at their colleges are friendly. Also, 68 percent of very satisfied students (versus 42 percent of dissatisfied students) maintain grade averages of "B-" or better. Fifty-nine percent of very satisfied students (versus 41 percent of dissatisfied students) feel black students can influence college policies which affect them.

In addition, three times as many very satisfied as dissatisfied students (37 percent versus 11 percent) would prefer to live in interracial dormitories. This appears to be a major source of discontent for dissatisfied students since 48 percent of them (and 49 percent of very satisfied students) actually live in interracial dorms. (It should be noted that the choices available included apartments off campus as well as different types of dormitories.)

One observation about satisfaction of students should be made even though only a small number of students is involved. Students whose primary source of funds for college is veteran's benefits are four times as well represented in the very satisfied subgroup as in the dissatisfied subgroup (nine percent versus two percent).

A final observation about satisfaction involves the concentration of dissatisfied students, as well as its absence, in various kinds of institutions. Of the forty colleges in the sample, seven had 40 percent or more dissatisfied students. Five of the seven were public. On the other hand, 10 colleges had 15 percent or smaller proportions of dissatisfied students. Of those 10 colleges, eight were private. While the percentage of the total number of students interviewed who were at least somewhat satisfied remained nearly constant at 73 percent, the difference among regions shifted considerably. Regional distinctions will be discussed later in the text.

PLANS AFTER GRADUATION

Grouping students according to whether they plan to attend graduate school full time, part time, or not at all revealed a great deal of similarity between them in attitudes, non-academic activities and, to an extent, academic experiences. The following variables measured highest among those planning full time graduate school, lower among those planning part time graduate school, and lowest among those planning no graduate school. Although the differences involved were slight, the pattern prevailed in terms of: (a) attending secondary school with less than 25 percent black enrollment; (b) having excellent academic preparation; (c) being very satisfied; (d) participating in student government; (e) believing black students can influence college policy; and (f) having family as the number one source of funds for college.

Academic backgrounds and experiences were, as one would expect, quite distinctive. Students planning graduate school full time were less likely than others to be attending a college in the same geographic region as their secondary school. They were almost twice as likely to be graduates of private secondary schools. And they were almost twice as likely to have grade averages of "B-" or better as those planning no graduate school (59 percent versus 32 percent).

The most interesting findings of this cross tabulation did not, however, involve characteristics of students. They involved characteristics of institutions attended by

those planning to attend graduate school full time. For example, 58 percent of those in highly selective institutions, and 42 percent in less selective institutions, planned to attend graduate school full time.

Most of the findings in this area distinguished private colleges from public colleges and gave further evidence that the experience of black students has been better in private than in public institutions. As indicated, the subgroup of colleges with the lowest concentration of black students (19 percent) planning to attend graduate school full time is small public colleges. The concentrations increase steadily in medium public and large public institutions, reach even higher levels in small private colleges, and are highest in large private colleges, where a majority (57 percent) of black students plan to attend graduate school.

Of forty institutions in the 1977 sample, 13 had 55 percent or more of their black students planning to attend graduate school full time. Of those institutions, 10 were private. On the other hand, nine institutions had 20 percent or smaller concentration of black students planning to attend graduate school full time; seven of them were public.

This is one area of investigation where the utility of a comparative study of white students is particularly evident. Attitudes on the campuses considered above might differ greatly between blacks and whites, but achievement of graduate school entry might prove to be similar. Certainly, large and small private colleges seem to be offering blacks the same advantages they present whites: excellent academic preparation and placement in graduate schools. This is an echo of the apparent success of private secondary schools whose college preparatory designation is earned. Whether they prepare their black students as successfully as their whites is a valid question for another study, but their black students are indeed better prepared than are most other black students for rigorous academic competition in college.

Chapter III Notes

1) Clark and Plotkin, 1963, p. 8.

CHAPTER 4 : COMPARISON OF SUBGROUPS OF INSTITUTION

The subgroups of institutions which were selected for examination in this study are those about which there has been considerable discussion and research as individuals have tried to identify factors in college environments that substantially affect the success or failure of black students. Our findings should illuminate both the choices of black students and those of people making related policy decisions in various types of colleges.

As indicated in the introduction, one of the most important and controversial groups has been the highly selective and prestigious colleges that, according to some, were doing very poorly with blacks. Clark and Plotkin's finding and the hypothesis here was that persistence and performance would be highest at the more prestigious colleges.

Another group which has provoked a great deal of interest involves sponsorship and the relative performance of public and private institutions. The finding by Ballard, Clark and Plotkin, and Peterson et al., as well as the hypothesis here was that the adjustment and performance of black students at private institutions would be superior to that of students at public institutions.

The last major group was colleges in various geographical regions. The primary hypothesis was that the South would have the most positive profile as it had in previous surveys. A secondary hypothesis was that the West would have the least positive profile. Clark and Plotkin had similar findings based on their data about the relative success rates of students who attended high school in various regions and the fact that for most students college enrollment usually is in the same region as high school attendance.

SELECTIVITY

With a few exceptions, the highly selective colleges with which ABC works closely began to enroll smaller numbers of black students several years ago, and that disturbing trend continues today. As word of this trend spreads, and as some colleges base recruitment targets on the immediately preceding year's already reduced numbers, fewer blacks apply to these colleges. This is paradoxical for two reasons: blacks historically place high value on education, and black students in highly selective colleges have done well; in fact, they have done better than those in less selective colleges.

In 1973, 36 percent of the black students in highly selective colleges reported maintaining grade averages of "B" or better, and by 1977, 60 percent of black students in highly selective colleges had such averages. The comparable percentages for less selective colleges were 23 and 39. Approximately 40 percent of the students in both types of colleges received special academic assistance.

Black students in highly selective colleges do not achieve their success by clustering in certain, less challenging majors. In fact, they had more diversity of majors throughout the 1970's than did students in less selective colleges. In 1977 the proportions of students majoring in biological science, engineering and math, and physical sciences were at least twice as large in highly selective colleges as in less selective ones (see Table IV.1).

TABLE IV.1: PERCENTAGE MAJORING IN VARIOUS FIELDS BY COLLEGE SELECTIVITY--1977

	Highly Selective	Less Selective	Signi-ficance
Social Sciences	32	22	.00
Business	14	27	
Education	3	15	
Biological Science	14	7	
Engineering and Math	9	4	
Physical Sciences	4	1	
Health Professions	2	7	
English	10	6	
Other			

On the other hand black students in highly selective white colleges achieve academic success without resorting to a "nothing-but-studying" lifestyle. They participate extensively in extracurricular activities as well as in academic pursuits. In fact, students in highly selective colleges are more active in extracurricular areas than students in less selective colleges (see Table IV.2).

This involvement is to some degree due to the fact that more students in highly selective colleges live on campus--66 percent versus 48 percent in less selective colleges. It also helps make living on campus enjoyable. More than half of the students in dormitories at highly selective colleges would prefer that type of housing; but, given a choice, only one-third of the students in dorms at less selective colleges would live there.

TABLE IV.2: PERCENTAGE IN SELECTED ACTIVITIES BY COLLEGE SELECTIVITY

	High. Sel. '73	High. Sel. '77	Less Sel. '73	Less Sel. '77	'77 Signif.
Black student organization	54	59	45	43	.00
Student government	13	14	10	10	.14
Radio, Newspaper, etc.	0	16	0	8	.00

Graduate school entered the plans of two-thirds of the black students enrolled at highly selective colleges in 1973, but by 1977 three-quarters of those students planned post-graduate education. In less selective colleges, graduate school was an aspiration of fewer students: 52 percent in 1973 and 56 percent in 1977. Even more striking is the fact that more than twice as many students in highly selective colleges in 1977 planned to attend graduate school full time (59 percent versus 26 percent) and that three times as many planned to pursue medical degrees (22 percent versus seven percent).

Success in highly selective colleges and plans to continue education in pursuit of graduate or professional degrees are linked to earlier academic preparation.[1] Sixty percent of black students attending highly selective colleges in 1973, and 57 percent in 1977, felt their academic preparation had been good or excellent. It should be noted that twice as many students in highly selective colleges were graduates of private secondary schools (18 percent versus nine percent). Moreover, less than one-quarter of the blacks in highly selective colleges (22 percent) were admitted under special programs.

Why then has enrollment of black students decreased? Discouraging reports about the cost ($9,000-10,000 per year) of highly selective colleges which overlook their generous need-based financial aid programs explain part of the decline. Students in more selective colleges not only are different from those in less selective colleges, but they are treated differently. In the crucial area of financial aid, students at more selective colleges are more likely to obtain scholarships sufficient to provide their primary source of funds and to have those scholarships come from the college itself (see Table IV.3). The fact that this difference became less pronounced between 1973 and 1977 could be important. Distorted reports about negative

experiences and rampant separatism also played a role in decreasing black enrollment at highly selective colleges.

TABLE IV.3: PERCENTAGE WITH VARIOUS PRIMARY SOURCES OF FUNDS BY COLLEGE SELECTIVITY

	High. Sel.		Less Sel.		'77
	'73	'77	'73	'77	Signif.
Family	18	22	21	20	.00
Scholarship from college	45	39	24	25	
Scholarship from other source	11	14	17	12	
Loan from college	6	6	12	10	
Loan from bank	6	4	6	5	
Loan from other source	2	2	3	1	
Personnel savings	1	1	5	2	
Wages	5	2	6	4	
Veteran's benefits	2	2	3	4	
Other					
No reply					

The most important factor, however, appears to be a failure to increase black enrollment at the traditional feeder schools for these colleges and at similarily high-quality public and private secondary schools. If, and as, black enrollment increases at those schools, it will increase at highly selective colleges and at the graduate schools for which they, in turn, serve as "feeder" institutions, whether or not the students come from families of high socioeconomic status. It should be noted that 39 percent of students at highly selective colleges and 32 percent at less selective colleges attended secondary schools which had black enrollments of 25 percent or lower. Evidence which led to this conclusion is found in the data gathered on ABC alumni, 88 percent of whom were attending highly selective colleges, and on a group of students from the sample, all of whom indicated excellent or good academic preparation and were attending highly selective colleges. (This material is discussed in detail later in this chapter).

As is the case with white students, highly selective colleges are more attractive to black students from families with high incomes and high levels of education (see Table IV.4). The proportion of black students in highly selective colleges from families with incomes over $25,000 is twice as large as the comparable proportion at less selective colleges. Similarily, twice as large a proportion

of students from families where both parents attended college are enrolled at highly selective colleges. It will take a generation to increase dramatically the proportion of black children with two college-educated parents, so no immediate increase in the pool of candidates for highly selective colleges can be expected there. On the other hand, the proportion of black families with incomes over $25,000 has been rising rapidly and should continue to do so. A larger number of traditional candidates for highly selective colleges among blacks should help increase enrollments.

TABLE IV.4: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF STUDENTS BY COLLEGE SELECTIVITY

	High. Sel. '73	High. Sel. '77	Less Sel. '73	Less Sel. '77	'77 Signif.
Family Income:					
$0-4,999	10	11	20	14	.00
$5,000-9,999	40	19	35	28	
$10,000-14,999	21	17	26	24	
$15,000-24,999	17	29	12	23	
$25,000 and over	6	24	6	12	
Parents' College Education:					
Both parents	22	33	14	16	.00
Father only	10	11	10	12	
Mother only	16	16	15	12	
Neither parent	50	40	62	60	

A major concern unfortunately remains about the amount of discrimination which persists. Throughout the 1970's slightly more than half of the black students in highly selective colleges reported being victims of discrimination at college. There is no consolation in the fact that less selective colleges have a record which is almost as bad (slightly less than 50 percent reporting discrimination). Prospective students who learn that the odds are against escaping discrimination on campus may simply shrug their shoulders and say, "Well, it's still America," or they may make other plans. In any case, priority attention should be given to reducing discrimination.

It is important to remember that non-traditional black candidates can be extremely well equipped for highly selective colleges. In 1973, Desegregating America's Colleges advised recruitment of students who, according to standard admissions criteria, would be likely to succeed. To a

large extent this has been done, and the increase in numbers of black students attaining "B" or better averages bears out the wisdom of this approach. There was in 1973, and is now, a need to consider the differences between individual students who may compensate for some weaknesses with strengths in other areas. This is standard admissions procedure. In addition, differences between blacks and whites need to be noted as part of the evaluation of probable success for a black student at a given college. Questions exist, for example, about the predictive capacity of standardized test scores for blacks if they are pooled with the results for whites.

Blacks cannot attend colleges in numbers proportional to their representation in the national population if they are selected by standards identical to those used for whites. The black population at large does not have the relative proportions of upper- and middle-income families from which to draw. More importantly, blacks are not represented in significant numbers at the secondary schools which provide many of the best-qualified college candidates.

In 1977 highly selective colleges had had several years of experience dealing with black students. A black presence existed on most campuses. These colleges tried recruitment of blacks, 40 percent of whom in 1973 were thought to need academic assistance, and only 36 percent of whom managed to achieve "B" or better averages. By 1977 selective colleges saw the need to offer special help to only 22 percent of their students, while 60 percent averaged "B" or better work. Colleges apparently have learned how to recruit students who do not need special assistance. If the leveling off of admissions requests is an indication, apparently the schools also have recruited about as many students as they can who fit their standard profile. The questions colleges must ask now are whether there are aspects of that profile which do not correlate well with blacks' academic performance, or which can be achieved after enrollment through academic assistance programs.

ABC students offer a resounding affirmative answer to the first question. ABC recruits students whose socioeconomic and previous academic backgrounds differ markedly from those of most preparatory school students and most entrants of highly selective colleges. With preparation at excellent secondary schools, however, these students enter outstanding colleges on an equal footing with relatively advantaged students whose success would be more easily predicted. The conclusion follows, and is discussed in the following section about ABC students, that secondary school preparation should be a particularly heavily weighted admissions criterion for black students.

The question regarding successful special assistance programs can only be answered by colleges. Have they learned to provide effective academic assistance to black students who lack preparation in some area? If they can find the nontraditional students with ability and motivation, can they offer the necessary supplementary scholastic reinforcement? Now that success has been achieved on one level with recruitment of black students, colleges can turn their energies toward examining what they have learned about special assistance, and toward providing properly selected students the help they need to meet rigorous scholastic demands.

Clear distinction must be made between the terms "special admissions" and "special assistance" as used here even though the two terms frequently are used interchangeably elsewhere. If schools recruit the person who does not precisely fit the standard profile but who can succeed with little or no extra help, that person may be considered a special admission, but he or she is not a special assistance candidate. In essence, in order to recruit substantial numbers of blacks, schools must be analytical, yet flexible, about admissions criteria and look toward offering effective assistance to low-risk candidates who need it. More movement toward this sort of special admission/special assistance distinction ought to occur in the future.

Some observers have concluded that almost all black students admitted to predominantly white colleges in the last seven or eight years entered through special programs of one type or another, or were "lumped together with those who did--regardless of the student's academic ability or preparation."[2] To the degree that this is true, one would expect lines of distinction between official special admissions and other black students to be blurred. An example of how blurred the distinctions actually have been involves academic preparation. Forty-three percent of the special admissions in this study reported excellent or good academic preparation, as compared to 59 percent of the other students. In addition, 45 percent of the special admissions came from families with incomes over $15,000, as compared to 46 percent of other students; and 33 percent of special admissions (versus 40 percent of other black students) plan to attend graduate school full time.

Special admissions overlap with other black students in so many ways that even receipt of special academic assistance is a blunt tool for distinguishing the two groups. Sixty percent of special-admissions students receive academic help, as do 34 percent of other black students.

One bit of data may help explain why special admissions now covers such a range of students. Special admissions in the 1977 survey were twice as well represented in engineering and math majors as were other black students. This indicates the success of intensive efforts (including provision of generous financial assistance) to interest more minority students in engineering courses. It also highlights an often overlooked fact: not all special admissions activities have as their goal high-risk or educationally disadvantaged students.

ABC COMPARISONS

A Better Chance, Inc. (ABC) has made it possible for over 3,000 nontraditional black students to enroll in college; most of them have enrolled in highly selective colleges. While conducting interviews for this study (1975 and 1977 only), an attempt was made to interview all ABC alumni attending colleges in the sample. In 1977, 48 interviews were completed at 14 colleges, and 88 percent of the students were at highly selective institutions. These interviews provide interesting comparisons with other black students at highly selective colleges because the backgrounds of ABC students are quite distinctive.

Sixty percent of other black students in highly selective colleges, and 52 percent of ABC secondary school graduates, report grade averages of "B" or better. Three-quarters of both groups plan to attend graduate school. Their preparation and admissions experiences are, however, quite different from each other. Fifty-seven percent of the other students found their academic preparation to be good or excellent, but 79 percent of the ABC students felt they were well prepared. In addition, 22 percent of the other students, but only 17 percent of ABC alumni, were officially admitted under special programs. ABC students also were more likely than any other group to feel that black students can influence college policy. Moreover, a larger proportion of ABC students shared that positive viewpoint in 1977 than in 1975 (73 percent versus 66 percent).

In 1975 the advantage of ABC alumni was even greater. Seventy-three percent of them, compared to 68 percent of other black students in highly selective colleges, reported grade averages of "B" or better. Ninety percent of the ABC students, versus 60 percent of other students, found their academic preparation to be good or excellent. In addition, seven percent of the ABC alumni, but 31 percent of the other students, were officially admitted through special programs.

There are several explanations for the increase in similarity between ABC students and others in highly selective colleges between 1975 and 1977. Widespread faculty and administrative concern about grade inflation apparently led to smaller numbers of students with high grade averages by 1977. That would not explain completely, however, why ABC students dropped in terms of percentage, feeling their preparation was good or excellent or why ABC students led other students in grade averages in 1975 but trailed them in 1977. The best available explanation for that lies in the fact that ABC, its member secondary schools, and highly selective colleges moved to loosen admissions requirements in the early 1970's and to tighten them again starting about 1974. Because ABC students enter the program primarily at the tenth-grade level, however, the group in college in 1977 contained substantial numbers of students who had entered secondary school during the period of somewhat relaxed requirements. In contrast, other students present in college in 1977, black and white, entered primarily under the retightened requirements.

Why do ABC alumni present such a positive profile? They share one important characteristic that the other students do not: they all attended outstanding secondary schools. Ninety-two percent of ABC alumni interviewed in 1977 were graduates of private schools, but only 18 percent of the other black students in highly selective colleges had attended such schools. As a result, a majority of other black students in highly selective colleges, like those in less selective colleges, attended secondary schools which were more than 25 percent black. ABC students, on the other hand, all attended secondary schools which were less than 25 percent black.

ABC alumni also share another characteristic, but few would argue that it gives them an advantage in adjusting to highly selective colleges: most of them come from families of low-socioeconomic backgrounds. Seventy-five percent are from families where neither parent attended college, while only 40 percent of other black students are from such families. In addition, only six percent of ABC alumni had family incomes over $15,000, but the majority (53 percent) of other black students in highly selective colleges had such incomes.

It should be noted that ABC students are much more willing to venture into unfamiliar areas than are other black students, including others at highly selective colleges. Most black students attend a college which is in the same geographic region as their secondary school. Even in highly selective colleges approximately half the black students fall into that category. In the case of ABC students, however, two-thirds are in colleges located in a

different region from their secondary school. This difference was even more pronounced in 1977 than in 1975. ABC students in 1977 were more likely to have been in a different region from their secondary school (31 percent versus 39 percent in the same region), and other students were slightly more likely to have been in the same region (64 percent versus 61 percent).

To test the ideas developed above about the factors contributing to the success of ABC alumni in highly selective colleges, it was decided to compare them to an elite subgroup of other black students in those colleges in 1977. The results as summarized in Tables IV.5 and IV.6 provide additional support for the thesis that outstanding, well integrated secondary schools do make a substantial difference.

The elite subgroup differs significantly from other black students at highly selective colleges (not including ABC alumni) in only three areas. The most striking difference is that more than twice as many of the elite subgroup attended private secondary schools. In addition, it should be noted that more of the elite subgroup attended schools which were less than 25 percent black and came from families where both parents had attended college.

The subgroup used for comparison consisted of those with good or excellent preparation who enrolled at highly selective colleges. More of them (46 percent) than ABC students (two percent) had college-educated parents. In turn, this special subgroup had more students with "B" or better grade averages than any other group (72 percent), fewer special admissions (12 percent), and comparable numbers (76 percent) planning to attend graduate school. The majority of them (52 percent) had graduated from schools which were less than 25 percent black, and 40 percent of them had graduated from private schools.

It will be necessary to conduct follow-up studies to substantiate further many of the responses reported here. In particular it would be of interest in this post-Bakke era to know whether the rates of obtaining degrees and going on to graduate school are as high as planned. There is, however, some evidence in another recent study that, at least for ABC alumni, the indications given here are reliable.

Many ABC alumni have earned degrees from highly selective colleges and universities. As noted above, that success could not have been predicted by looking at their family backgrounds. It also could not have been predicted by looking at their SAT scores alone. Many of them have graduated with honors even though their scores were as much as 300-400 points below the median for their college.

TABLE IV.5: COMPARISON OF FOUR GROUPS OF BLACK COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1977

	I. ABC alumni (most at hi.sel.colls)	II. At Less Sel. Coll.	III. At Hi. Sel. Coll.	IV. Subgp of III.with Ex.or gd. Prep.
Both parents attended college	2	16	33	46
Neither parent attended college	75	60	40	36
Family income $15,000+	6	35	53	56
Secondary school less than 25% black	100	32	39	52
Secondary school private	92	9	18	40
College and secondary school in same region	31	80	64	48
Academic preparation excellent or good	79	55	57	100
Grade average B- or better	52	39	60	72
College housing: interracial dorm	67	48	66	74
Working at college	73	40	52	60
Full-time graduate school plans	60	26	59	60

TABLE IV.6: COMPARISON OF FOUR GROUPS OF BLACK COLLEGE STUDENTS. . . RANK ORDER ON VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS

	I. ABC alumni (most at hi.sel.colls)	II. At Less Sel. Coll.	III. At Hi. Sel. Coll.	IV. Subgp of III.with Ex.or gd. Prep.
Both parents attended college	4	3	2	1
Neither parent attended college	1	2	3	4
Family income $15,000+	4	3	2	1
Secondary school less than 25% black	1	4	3	2
Secondary school private	1	4	3	2
College and secondary school in same region	2	4	3	1
Academic preparation excellent or good	2	4	3	1
Grade average B- better	3	4	2	1
College housing: interracial dorm	2	4	3	1
Working at college	1	4	3	2
Full-time graduate school plans	1	4	3	2

While it is true that minority students obtain lower test scores than their white colleagues at the same institutions, there is strong evidence that those scores do not mean minority students are "unqualified" or even "less qualified" for these colleges. Although there is approximately a 200-point gap between the scores of the minority students studied and other students at sample colleges, their major fields and graduation rates are comparable. And within the group of minority students, the graduation rates do not vary from those with the lowest scores to those with the highest.[3]

The experience of outstanding secondary school preparation does make a difference for black students even when earlier educational environments have been poor, as is the case with ABC students. These students attended elementary and junior high schools that were anything but top rank, but they arrive at top colleges ready to compete successfully, and possibly with a slight advantage over other black students. This advantage probably results from both the superior instruction of the high-quality learning environment and the resultant confidence it gives the student as he or she enters the integrated and academically demanding college.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

There has been considerable change since 1973 in the difference between the experience of black students in private colleges and those in public. In 1973 the two types of institutions provided blacks with similar experiences, probably because neither black secondary school students nor the colleges themselves distinguished between the two types of institutions with regard to their approaches to the education of blacks. In other words, it was more true then that all concerned with the college entrance process tended to see both black students and the prospective colleges as groups of indistinguishable individuals and institutions. By 1977 private colleges were moving toward approaching black candidates more as they did white ones, as individuals whose attributes should be weighed along with the specific ability of the college to use or respond to them. In response, black students began to appreciate the varied opportunities offered by different colleges. Substantial variations began to appear in the students whom different colleges enrolled as well as in the experience of those students.

The current study does not confirm all the stereotypes about differences between public and private institutions. In general, however, private colleges do seem to have progressed farther than public ones in dealing successfully

with black students. Similar findings were reported in a study by a group at the University of Michigan.[4] These findings should encourage more black students to apply to private colleges (especially those which are highly selective) and help to reverse a trend of declining pools of black applicants. Negative publicity about the Bakke case and about rapidly rising costs at private colleges has led many black students to select themselves out of competition for places at top private colleges. This is happening even though the historical record of private colleges also is better than public colleges--by 1910, 149 blacks had graduated from Oberlin, 60 from Kansas, and only two from the City College of New York.[5]

Many of the most popular notions about private colleges were not supported by the findings of this study. For example, private colleges did not greatly surpass public ones in the proportion of black students with family incomes over $15,000. Two subtypes of institutions had 50 percent or more of their students in the upper-income categories: large private colleges with 52 percent and medium-sized public colleges with 50 percent.

There also was little support for the idea that more students in expensive private colleges are concerned about financing their education than are their peers in public colleges. Larger private colleges were tied with large public colleges in having the second lowest percentage of students (43 percent) concerned about financing their education. Small private colleges, however, were highest, with 56 percent concerned about finances. This is related to the types of aid commonly offered by the various institutions. In private colleges which have significant endowments, the main source of funding is scholarships for 55 percent of students. In public colleges only 40 percent of students finance their education primarily through scholarships; they or their families must supplement financial aid, adding a second worry to concerns about maintaining the scholarship assistance. In addition, students in private colleges carry a smaller burden than do those in public colleges in terms of jobs as part of or as a supplement to financial aid. Of those students who were working, a much larger proportion in private colleges worked fewer than 10 hours a week; in small, medium, and large public institutions respectively, 17, 29, and 18 percent worked that little, while 67 percent of students from small private colleges and 32 percent from large private universities worked fewer than 10 hours.

A final unexpected finding should be noted. The two subtypes of institutions where fewest students felt that black students could influence college policy were small public colleges and small private colleges. Students in

large private colleges felt most capable of influencing policy. Moreover, the attitude of students about the responsiveness of their colleges to the needs of black students is virtually the same in both private and public colleges, with a majority of students feeling both types should be more responsive.

The amount of black enrollment in the various subtypes of colleges gives support to the idea that public and private institutions are not as different as one might think in responsiveness. In our 1977 sample there was proportionally more representation of public institutions than private ones in the low black enrollment category. In addition, both private subtypes were as well represented in the high black enrollment category as both medium and large public institutions. Because one of the highest priority changes desired by black undergraduates is higher levels of black enrollment, it is appropriate to conclude that private colleges have been quite responsive.

On the other hand, some important and expected differences were found between public and private colleges. Twice as many black students in private as in public colleges were graduates of private secondary schools (almost 20 percent versus less than 10 percent). More students in private colleges felt their academic preparation for college had been good or excellent (about 60 percent versus about 50 percent) and, unlike 1973, the advantage in preparation contributed to higher grade averages in private colleges (55 percent "B-" or higher versus about 40 percent). In addition, many more students in private colleges planned to attend graduate school full time (more than half versus less than one-third). This also was quite different from 1973 when the two types of institutions were almost identical in this area, with 44 and 47 percent of students planning to attend graduate school full time.

It should be noted that the more successful academic adjustment in private colleges was not accomplished through avoidance of challenging majors. Twice as large a proportion of students in private colleges majored in biological sciences. Also, 50 percent more students majored in math or engineering in large private institutions as in large public institutions, with only incidental numbers of students in such majors in smaller institutions of either type.

An explanation for the better academic adjustment in private colleges would have to include several other factors. Approximately two-thirds of students in private colleges identified the academic reputation of the college as an important factor in their choice, while approximately half the students in public colleges did so. In addition, approximately 70 percent of students in private colleges

cited size of classes as a positive characteristic of their college, while approximately 50 percent of those at public colleges felt that way. In public colleges, on the other hand, many more students, in fact a majority of them, emphasized proximity to home in making their choice. Over 80 percent of black students in public colleges enrolled at institutions in the same geographic region as their secondary schools, while only approximately 60 percent of those in private colleges attended secondary schools in the same region.

Private colleges are making progress toward recruiting well prepared students who understand the academic program of the college and choose to participate in it. By giving those students classes of manageable size in the areas of student interest, the private institutions encourage and facilitate good scholastic performance. The provision of adequate, dependable financial aid allows students to concentrate successfully on that performance.

From 1973 through 1977 special admissions programs were much less evident at private than at public institutions. Only 10 percent of black students at private colleges in 1977 entered through special programs, while 20 percent or more in public colleges (38 percent in large public) were special admits. In those large public institutions fewer black students than in any other subtype of college found white students to be friendly. Only 47 percent of black students in large public colleges felt that way, while a majority of every other type (from 56 percent to 70 percent) felt white students were friendly. Is alienation from white students directly related to the "special" status of these students?

Students in private colleges also were more active in extracurricular activities. Only 12 to 15 percent of those in private colleges participated in no extracurricular activities, while twice as many (21 to 31 percent) in public colleges abstained. Attitudes toward association with whites may combine here with the larger number of students at public institutions who live off campus to reduce black participation in college-sponsored activities.

Approximately one-quarter of black students in public and one-fifth of those in private colleges previously attended another college. The transfer patterns for each type of college were more similar in 1977 than they had been in 1973. In 1973 more than half (57 percent) the transfers to public four-year colleges came from two-year colleges, while only one-third (32 percent) of those in private four-year colleges had started at community colleges. By 1977 the proportion of community-college transfers at public four-year colleges had decreased substantially, and the proportion at private four-year colleges

had decreased only slightly, so both types of institutions had similar concentrations of community college transfers. In fact, public colleges joined private ones in having approximately one-quarter of their transfers originate at public two-year colleges.

Both public and private predominantly white colleges increased from 1973 to 1977 in the proportion of transfers from predominantly black colleges. The proportions which had been very small in 1973 reached approximately 20 percent by 1977. This still does not suggest the type of "brain drain" of the type which has concerned some people. On the other hand, if the trend continues, a substantial problem could develop.

Before closing this comparison of public and private institutions, it is necessary to clarify that "private" does not imply "selective" nor does "public" imply "nonselective." In the sample for this study, however, the majority (approximately two-thirds) of private colleges are highly selective, and only about 1⅞ percent of public colleges are highly selective.

Based on the findings of this study about trends in the 1970's, it appears appropriate to project increased differentiation between public and private colleges in terms of the experience of black students. As is the case with white students, the more selective private colleges can be expected to enroll black students who are better equipped and prepared than are those at less selective public colleges. The proportion of students who attended private secondary schools also should be expected to grow more rapidly at private than at public colleges. These secondary schools traditionally send proportionally large numbers of all their white students to private colleges; the same is true for their slowly increasing numbers of black students. The black students at private colleges may be substantially more affluent than those at public colleges, but this remains to be seen. More of those at private colleges will in all likelihood succeed in achieving their goal of enrolling in graduate school, particularly in medical and law schools.

It also is to be expected that, with the exception of certain public colleges which are headed toward "tipping over" to predominantly minority enrollment, private colleges will continue to do as well as public colleges in the proportion of places taken by minority students. Finally, it is to be expected that the advantage held by private colleges in relative generosity of financial aid will continue as "Proposition 13" type cutbacks weaken further the financial capabilities of many public institutions.

REGION

The 1970's have not produced identical patterns of experience for black students in all parts of the country. In fact, there is considerable variation from one region to another. The least positive experience has been in the West, but there are signs of improvement there. Unfortunately, however, the 1973 and 1977 studies show signs of deterioration in the Midwest. The most positive experience has been in the South, while the Northeast has moved forward to second position.

Three indicators of the quality of experience for black undergraduates are worth noting: percentage officially admitted under special programs, percentage dissatisfied with the overall college experience, and percentage saying race is a dominant factor in their choice of friends and activities. With the positive association between special admissions and inadequate academic performance, these three factors give a fair indication of both black student achievement and attitude toward the integrated college experience.

Throughout the 1970's the West has registered high levels on these indicators. It is the only region in which more than 60 percent of the students were admitted under special programs (see Table IV.7). The use of special admissions programs has decreased everywhere, but, according to the 1977 survey, four out of ten students in the West still entered this way. At the same time more students in the West than in any other region have been dissatisifed (see Table IV.8). This appeared to be changing in 1977, and perhaps a positive momentum will develop. In any case it should be noted that by 1977, 70 percent or more of black students were at least somewhat satisfied with college.

TABLE IV.7: PERCENTAGE OFFICIAL SPECIAL ADMISSION BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	--	--	--	--	--
1975	51	27	25	61	.00
1977	36	16	5	41	.00

The West shows a similarly disappointing pattern by having more students whose experience with interracial education is such that race is dominant in their choice of friends and activities. In fact, it is the only region in either the 1973 or 1977 survey to have a majority of students saying that race was their primary consideration (see Table IV.9).

Why has the situation in the West been so negative? There are several explanatory factors to consider. In addition, there are several explanations which probably would be popular but which are not helpful.

Academic preparation would be expected to be important, and it is. The West consistently has ranked last in terms of the proportion of students with excellent academic preparation (see Table IV.10), and the gap between it and the other regions is growing. The situation is similar for good academic preparation, but the West showed improvement here by 1977 (see Table IV.11).

TABLE IV.8: PERCENTAGE DISSATISFACTION WITH THE OVERALL COLLEGE EXPERIENCE BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	42	34	26	45	--
1975	20	25	27	40	.00
1977	26	31	21	26	.11

TABLE IV.9: PERCENTAGE FOR WHOM RACE DOMINANT IN CHOICE OF FRIENDS AND ACTIVITIES BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	36	40	40	58	--
1975	27	29	24	30	.75
1977	22	25	14	20	.00

In light of the literature on difference between residential and non-residential colleges,[6] the number of students living on campus should also be important. In this area the West stands apart with far fewer students on campus (see Table IV.12).

In addition, some attention should be given to socioeconomic factors and to the possibility that problems in the West are related to low socioeconomic status. In this case, however, the hypothesis is not supported. In fact, the West was second in family income over $10,000 in 1973 and first in that category in 1975 when the interim follow-up was done. But in 1977, when the situation was brighter in the West, the region had the fewest students with family income over $10,000 (see Table IV.13). Perhaps even more surprising, more students in the West consistently had parents with college education (see Table IV.14).

Regional differences emerge again in the prevalence of racial discrimination at colleges. Once again the West leads in an undesirable category. It is the only region in

TABLE IV.10: PERCENTAGE WITH EXCELLENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	10	11	11	8	--
1975	14	16	14	10	.00
1977	16	12	19	6	.00

TABLE IV.11: PERCENTAGE WITH GOOD ACADEMIC PREPARATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	36	33	53	29	--
1975	53	39	42	38	00
1977	39	34	51	46	.00

which 50 percent or more of respondents in all three surveys reported being victims of discrimination at their colleges (see Table IV.15). On the other hand, there has been a steady, though slight, decrease in the incidence of discrimination in the West from 1973 to 1977. There has, however, been less progress in the critical area of discrimination by faculty (see Table IV.16).

TABLE IV.12: PERCENTAGE IN INTERRACIAL DORM BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Year	NW	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	33	63	62	11	--
1975	62	64	70	32	.00
1977	72	49	65	22	.00

TABLE IV.13: PERCENTAGE WITH FAMILY INCOME $10,000 OR MORE BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	46	48	34	46	--
1975	59	55	41	66	.00
1977	64	68	59	58	.01

TABLE IV.14: PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING AT LEAST ONE PARENT WITH SOME COLLEGE EDUCATION BY REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	34	45	36	57	--
1975	40	47	45	63	.02
1977	39	57	40	56	.00

Because there are indications of improvement in the West, the region which causes greatest concern is the Midwest. In almost all cases in the Midwest there is movement, and the movement is in a negative direction. After ranking third in dissatisfied students in both 1973 and 1975, the Midwest moved to first position in 1977 (see Table IV.8). Similarly, the Midwest moved from second to first with the most students for whom race determined the choice of friends and activities (see Table IV.9).

While the Midwest was experiencing the problems documented above, three changes were occurring which help explain the other changes. The Midwest slipped in terms of excellent and good academic preparation (see Table IV.10 and IV.11). It moved from second to first as the region with most racial discrimination (see Table IV.15). Perhaps equally important is the movement from first to third place in terms of the proportion of students living on campus (see Table IV.12).

What about socioeconomic status? Between 1973 and 1977 the Midwest moved from second to first in terms of parental education, and it was first in family incomes over $10,000 both in 1973 and 1977 (see Table IV.13 and IV.14). Apparently the traditional advantages of family income and education are not overriding at this level.

TABLE IV.15: PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS OF DISCRIMINATION AT COLLEGE BY REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	46	50	43	59	--
1975	37	45	44	57	.01
1977	48	62	40	50	.00

TABLE IV.16: PERCENTAGE EXPERIENCING DISCRIMINATION BY FACULTY BY REGION

Year	NE	MW	S	W	chi square significance
1973	49	35	42	45	--
1975					
1977	35	45	46	59	.04

It, therefore, appears that the West succeeded in moving out of last place as a region for blacks to pursue college degrees less because of positive developments there than becaue of negative developments in the Midwest. Anyone who is involved with higher education in the Midwest should be concerned about the deteriorating situation in that region.

People in the Northeast, on the other hand, should be encouraged that their region is doing well and moving in a positive direction. As the tables indicate, the Northeast has progressed after some over-publicized mis-steps in the early 1970's and now has the second most positive profile for black undergraduates.

Through a process of elimination it is clear that the most favorable regional profile is to be found in the South. It consistently has admitted the fewest "special" candidates; it had virtually none by 1977 (see Table IV.7). It also ranked last in numbers of dissatisfied students and in students for whom race was the dominant factor in selection of friends in two of the three surveys (see Tables IV.8 and IV.9).

Why has the experience of black undergraduates been most positive in the South? The South ranked first or second in all surveys both on excellent and good academic preparation (see Tables IV.10 and IV.11). It also was the only region with over 60 percent of respondents living in interracial dorms in all three surveys (see Table IV.12). In addition, the South was fourth or third in prevalence of racial discrimination on campus (see Table IV.15).

It should be noted that the positive profile in the South exists even though it was at the bottom in terms of socioeconomic status. In each survey it had fewest with family incomes over $10,000 and ranked third in parental college education.

The concluding remarks on regional variation in the report on Stage I of this study remain appropriate.

> Fortunately, most of the distinctive positive characteristics of colleges in the South are not exclusively the result of its peculiar history. They can be reproduced in any of the other regions through alterations in the way black students are perceived, recruited, and treated.[7]

OTHER COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS

Some characteristics of colleges, unlike geographic region, selectivity, and sponsorship, seemed to have less influence on the success of black students in 1977 than they had in 1973. For example, the magnitude of black enrollment and the relative proximity to a major urban area became virtually irrelevant to the experiences of black students. Because most colleges have more than a token number of blacks but have stabilized their black enrollment at less than 10 percent, it is not surprising that differences in the size of black student groups make only a minor impact on the students. Being at a college with an eight percent rather than a six percent black student enrollment probably does not register in the consciousness of most students. On the other hand, it is somewhat surprising (very surprising to some) that a nonmetropolitan location is not as unattractive as many have alleged.

Location simply will not suffice to explain why only small numbers of blacks enroll at a particular institution. Only one-quarter (versus 17 percent in other subtypes of colleges) of students in nonmetropolitan colleges feel negatively about the kind of place in which the college is located. Moreover, nonmetropolitan colleges in 1977 had fewer dissatisfied students than the other types of colleges (see Table IV.17).

As the table also indicates, colleges in major cities have not changed at all since 1973 in the proportion of dissatisfied blacks in their student bodies. In the other types of colleges, however, the proportion of dissatisfied black students has decreased dramatically; in rural locations the percentage has been halved.

Perhaps the most significant factor in explaining the advantage held by city colleges in 1973 was the fact that they had done better than other colleges in attracting black faculty members and administrators. As Table IV.18 shows, this advantage, at least in the perception of black students, had disappeared by 1977.

TABLE IV.17: PERCENTAGE DISSATISFIED STUDENTS BY LOCATION OF COLLEGE

	1973	1977	'77 Signif. = .51
Major urban college	30	29	
Other urban college	40	25	
Non-urban college	42	22	

Clearly, no type of predominantly white college has reason to rejoice about its record regarding black employment. In all types of institutions increasing percentages of black students cite this as a negative characteristic; 80 percent of black students complain about it. It should be noted, however, that in rural colleges the increase has been slight, while in urban colleges it has been more than 50 percent. Apparently the early promise indicated by employment of those first blacks has not been fulfilled. The reception black faculty members received on white campuses would not lead many of them to defend the colleges' efforts.

An important disadvantage for the college in a major urban area is the financial status of its students. Many more students in those colleges than elsewhere have to work long hours to make ends meet. Students with jobs for twenty-one to forty hours a week were 33 percent of those in major urban colleges, 11 percent in other urban colleges and nine percent of those in non-metropolitan colleges. Predictably, twice as large a proportion of students in major urban colleges as elsewhere cited financial problems as a concern.

Another major disadvantage attributed to urban institutions involves discrimination against students by faculty members. In 1977 a majority of students (53 percent) reported such discrimination in only one sub-type of college according to location: colleges in major-urban areas. The other sub-types had 37 percent experiencing discrimination in other-urban colleges and 42 percent in non-metropolitan colleges.

Although there are, as noted above, few areas where level of black enrollment makes much difference to black students, it is worth commenting about some of them. One such area is the feeling by black students that they have

TABLE IV.18: PERCENTAGE OF BLACK STUDENTS CITING SCARCITY OF BLACK FACULTY MEMBERS/ ADMINISTRATORS AS A NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTIC BY LOCATION OF COLLEGE

	1973	1977
Major urban college	51	83
Other urban college	64	86
Non-urban college	76	79

been victims of racial discrimination at college. In 1973 that feeling was more prevalent in institutions with higher black enrollment (see Table IV.19). By 1977 the pattern had been reversed, and students in low black enrollment institutions were more likely to feel racial discrimination. It appears that having substantial, but no longer increasing and therefore no longer threatening, numbers of black students makes it possible for discrimination to subside slightly or for blacks to feel secure enough to ignore it. In colleges with small numbers of black students where their presence remains something of a novelty, six out of ten experience discrimination.

More important to the experience of black students, however, is the source of the discrimination. Unfortunately, the most damaging kind of discrimination--that from faculty members--appears to increase as black enrollment increases (see Table IV.20). In fact, the group of students reporting discrimination from faculty members is almost twice as large in institutions with high black enrollment as in those with low.

TABLE IV.19: PERCENTAGE FEELING IMPACT OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BY LEVEL OF BLACK ENROLLMENT

Type of Institution	1973	1977	'77 Signif. = .01
Low black enrollment	36	58	
Medium black enrollment	53	47	
High black enrollment	50	46	

TABLE IV.20: TYPE OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION EXPERIENCED IN 1977 BY LEVEL OF BLACK ENROLLMENT

	Percentage black enrollment		
	Low	Med.	High
Faculty discrimination	34	45	63
Harassment by students and others	35	17	6

Another area where high black enrollment had an expected result in 1977 (but not in 1973) is in decreasing feeling that the college is unresponsive to the needs of black students. Because there was a substantial majority in all three surveys who felt that black enrollment should be higher, it follows that those colleges with more black students should be seen as more responsive. As Table IV.21 shows, however, this was not the case in 1973.

In attempting to understand the changes between 1973 and 1977, it is helpful to note that the composition of the high black enrollment category changed significantly. Along with urban, non-selective, public institutions some non-metropolitan, highly selective, private institutions attained the high enrollment level. This was the result of carefully designed and persistent efforts by the latter type of institution to enroll more black students.

Also, in 1977 colleges with low black enrollment were not enrolling students primarily from secondary schools which were predominantly black. Six colleges in the 1977 sample had 50 percent or more of their black students from secondary schools which were less than 25 percent black. Three of those colleges had low black enrollment, and the other three had middle-level black enrollment. Therefore, students at these colleges already had had experience coping with overwhelmingly white environments. Their reports of racial discrimination on campus and the lack of college responsiveness to black needs were not the result of misconceptions resulting from lack of experience in dealing with the majority.

TABLE IV.21: PERCENTAGE WITH NEGATIVE REACTION TO RESPONSIVENESS OF COLLEGE BY LEVEL OF BLACK ENROLLMENT

Type of Institution	1973	1977	'77 Signif. = .02
Low black enrollment	53	72	
Medium black enrollment	58	72	
High black enrollment	65	60	

Chapter IV Notes

1) Clark and Plotkin's 1963 study reached a similar conclusion.
2) Peterson et al., 1978, p. 168.
3) See Boyd's Change article, 1977, on SAT scores.
4) Peterson et al., p. 31.
5) Ballard, 1973, p. 52.
6) Astin, Four Critical Years, 1977, for example.
7) Boyd, Desegregating America's Colleges, 1974.

CHAPTER 5 : IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Predominantly white colleges must plan for the second decade of expanded black participation rather than drift into it as many did ten years ago. This study was designed to aid the planning process. As Peterson et al. documented in a study designed to assess the responses of institutions of higher education to the challenge of increasing black enrollments, those institutions which developed a plan, however hastily, did better in the first decade of campus integration than those which only reacted to dramatic events.

Peterson et al. also noted that the likelihood of planned response was higher in more selective institutions.

> Planning for this important social change...was evidently limited. Anticipatory or planned responses which predated black enrollment increases were extremely limited. Explicit statements of enrollment goals and anticipated programs were apparent in only the three adaptive institutions... The experiences of these three institutions reflect a pattern which may be typical of more prestigious institutions with basically supportive environments for social issues and strong institutional governance mechanisms.[1]

The ABC study saw the results of this pattern in the more favorable experience of students at those selective institutions.

One purpose of this study was to provide a factual framework within which effective planning could take place. The study is an historical record of the college experience of the first generation of black students to have full access to the wide spectrum of majority education. Our findings often contradict journalistic and more narrowly focused scholarly reports of that period of integration. These data should help colleges to analyze their performance during that period and to prepare for change which will be cost-effective. This isolation of variables which are important to students should prevent wasted effort on meaningless or peripherally important change. The data also should help colleges select students who are likely to take best advantage of each institution's offerings and respond to the needs of a broader range of black students.

The approach suggested is an informed answer to special admission. It does not appear profitable to admit large numbers of poorly qualified students and then try to prepare them for the experience they already are having.

Instead, colleges can decide with reasonable expectation of success to establish policies to enroll more black students who are ready for the type of educational experience they offer.

New data and understanding from experience can lead to institutional changes so that blacks become satisfied, permanent, and active components of the college network. Now that the initial effort to cope with the unknown and the frightened attempts to wrestle with the crises which followed have been accomplished, more reasoned approaches are in order. It is surprising that academic institutions, bastions of rationality, did not move in this direction sooner. Most institutions saw a need to take steps to deal with tensions.

> The paradox is that, despite this reported concern, not one of the institutions attempted to ascertain in a systematic way what made it more or less attractive to black students or how black students' perceptions of the institutions differed from those of white students.[2]

In planning, colleges should take advantage of the resources of their faculties which were not used or were not available 10 years ago. The actors in the dramas of the late-1960's and early-1970's were almost exclusively students, administrators, and trustees.[3] Faculty members usually opted out or were excluded by black students who were aware that it was easier to deal with/get concessions from administrators than from the faculty. What was not apparent to black students of that era was the need to expand that strategy. Administrators could offer life-saving first aid, but substantial faculty cooperation was needed to implement basic changes in the treatment of blacks in the classroom, in employment practices, or in curriculum.

In 1969 most predominantly white colleges had no black faculty member. As a result, no knowledgeable, adult blacks were part of early planning and reacting of these institutions. By 1979 there were black faculty members on most college campuses. Some of them, representing diverse viewpoints, should be involved in planning for the 1980's.

The place to start intelligent planning is a review and assessment of the current situation. How much has been achieved at a particular institution? If goals for increased black enrollment were set, have they been met? Is an upward trend in black enrollment and employment reaching a plateau or even beginning a downward trend? As experience is gained, is the match between black students who are admitted and their colleges improving? Has the emergence

of other concerns, such as affirmative action for Spanish-speaking people, been added to, or has it diluted, concern for blacks? Are the issues which most concern black students changing?

If college officials do not wish to devote time to this kind of review, they may once again lose control of events. As we reach the tenth anniversary of the various protests and building takeovers by black students, the current generation of black students will be looking back and perhaps romanticizing the protestors. They may also conclude, if there are no indicators to the contrary, that the only way, or the most effective way, to get responsiveness from the colleges is through demonstrations. In another scenario black applications for admission simply decrease sharply as potential students conclude that neither acquiescence nor demonstration hastens change.

Complacency is not an appropriate reaction for predominantly white colleges at this time. Although the existence of over one hundred predominantly black colleges makes it unnecessary for blacks to be represented in predominantly white colleges to the degree to which they are in the population, higher levels must be obtained than those which currently prevail. The efforts necessary to increase black enrollment need not be as expensive as they were 10 years ago in terms of financial aid, special supportive services, and special facilities, but colleges will have to commit sizable amounts of scarce resources to this important activity.

Similarily, efforts to recruit minority faculty members and administrators will require commitment of resources, but not at the level which was necessary ten years ago. The scarcity of black Ph.d.'s has slightly eased since 1969, as college freshmen of 1969 or 1970 are old enough now to have obtained graduate degrees. Moreover, it is possible now in most cases for a black academic to consider a position without all the extra problems attendant to being a "first black" or a pioneer.

In conducting both recruitment of faculty, and recruitment and admission of students, colleges can be considerably less defensive about their locations or sizes. There are blacks of all ages who prefer the countryside to the city as well as some who fit the stereotype of the big-city dwellers who cannot get to sleep unless they can see a neon sign. In the same way, blacks vary greatly in terms of the scale of institution they prefer.

The data compiled here show the diversity of black-student interests, backgrounds, and achievements. Colleges

wishing to appeal to blacks would do well to emphasize, as they do with whites, the excellence of their programs. This study shows the proportional success of students who selected their college because of the institution's academic reputation. Black students rated good academic reputation as most important

> while white students perceived the black students as placing less emphasis on (this). The implication, of course, is that greater attention to black students' academic interests should be a major concern. This requires a response from faculty and department-level academic programs--a level at which...the institutions have not been particularly responsive.[4]

Students who respond to the program a college offers consider many factors; two are extremely important to blacks and probably not so important to whites. Black students look for the absence of discrimination and the presence of black faculty members and administrators as evidence of integration which extends beyond enrollment statistics.

Colleges, especially highly selective ones, need to counter the spreading impression that they are not so eager to have black students as they were a few years ago. Black students, their teachers, and their counselors hear stories about decreasing numbers of black applicants, declining black enrollments, tighter financial aid, and overreactions to the Bakke case. Encouraging more black students with high ability to seek places at top colleges should be given high priority by black opinion-leaders as well as officials of predominantly white colleges. As this study shows, these institutions produce a high proportion of black students bound for graduate school and professional careers. Those colleges, therefore, have a key role in eliminating the shortages of black professionals about which so much has been said and written.

This study also indicates that highly selective colleges can do something to help increase their pool of interested, well prepared applicants by encouraging (or even participating in) efforts to increase black enrollment in private secondary schools (and integrated honors public high schools). When black students enter this kind of secondary school, they take a timely first step on the path which leads most directly to professional careers. Currently, most highly selective colleges have higher levels of black enrollment than do these feeder schools, so there is much room for improvement. The return can be high on a limited investment of time and money in the area of increasing enrollment in private secondary schools.

Similarly, pre-college or summer programs designed to help black students understand various career opportunities and the methods of preparing for them can help recruitment and retention of the most promising students. Many of the attempts of the early 1970's to provide this kind of grounding failed. Either they simply could not provide the help needed, or they did it in such a way that it was prohibitively expensive. Locating students with real interest and probability of college attendance, and providing relevant material can be more cost-efficient than trying to establish meaningful contact in dozens of areas or attempting to provide an entire secondary education in three months.

As more blacks are on campus, this study confirms, some other problems have to be addressed. Foremost among them are racial discrimination from faculty members and a tendency for black and white students to avoid experiences which can help them develop mutual understanding which will be critical in later life. Administrators, especially presidents, should consider creating occasions for constructive exchange between faculty leaders and black students reflecting the diversity of black students on campus in terms of majors, career plans, and extracurricular pursuits. Similar opportunities for exchange between black and white students also would be helpful.

Trustees can play a constructive role. As they search for presidents, trustees of prestigious private colleges should consider following the lead of a few respected public institutions and The Ford Foundation in choosing blacks. The second decade of substantial black involvement with predominantly white colleges should not end as the first did--before the selection of a single black to lead a top private college. There now are enough blacks who are both interested and qualified to make such a choice possible.

More generally, colleges must reach beyond considering blacks almost exclusively for "black" jobs. When almost every college has for some years had at least a black in the admissions office, when will substantial numbers of blacks become head of admissions offices? There has been progress. Many colleges now give their black admissions officers a broader portfolio than just minority recruitment. A similar pattern has been established in deans' offices. Interestingly, however, one Ivy League college has had a black Dean of the (entire) College and another Ivy League college has a black Dean of (all) Students. Other institutions need to follow the example. The same pattern exists in faculties. The 1980's are late in the game for blacks to be chosen to chair departments other than Black Studies. Those institutions which make positive steps in

these areas and make them known to black students, their parents, and their guidance counselors will have substantial recruiting advantages.

We are entering a crucial third phase in the desegregation of American higher education. The first phase of (1969-73) produced many false starts, some dramatic setbacks, and considerable progress. In the second phase (1974-79) most colleges settled into a reasonably comfortable groove as gains of the first half-decade were consolidated. The key question for the third phase is whether that groove will become a rut. During this phase it will be determined whether predominantly white colleges can complete the journey to becoming truly integrated institutions.

Diminished tensions and development of more realistic perspectives among college officials and black students about what rate of change is feasible are not ends in themselves. Elimination of the clutter of rhetoric and misguided activities which proliferated in the early 1970's needs to be followed by a re-direction of energies to the solution of fundamental problems which are now more clearly visible.

We can discard that misguided pair of assumptions that blacks were unqualified academically and that their presence would undermine academic standards. Black students have been able and willing in increasing numbers to do the work at predominantly white colleges. They can also enrich those colleges. The presence of black students can and does lead to pressure for changes which can and does enhance the pursuit of greater understanding of and solutions to basic problems in American society.

Like other institutions in the society, colleges have responded to black demands for full participation primarily with bread and circuses rather than with fundamental alterations. The report on the first stage of this study noted that colleges had been working hardest to meet the lowest-level needs of black students. These needs

> involve minor institutional adjustments which may signify nothing more than a new tokenism. The needs are special social and political channels which ease the adjustment of black students to important aspects of college life in addition to the academic ones. All-black lounges, centers, or dorms and special entertainment or cultural budgets and/or events are examples of the social needs. Special recruitment, advising and counseling or disciplinary channels are examples of political needs.[5]

Since then many of the special channels which were created have been closed or restricted. This might be a positive step if it means attention is being shifted to higher priority needs.

It is appropriate to note, as has been done in this report, that dissatisfaction among black students is decreasing in many areas. On the other hand, only 10 percent of students were very satisfied with their overall college experience by 1977. If progress is made in meeting the higher priority needs of black students, that proportion should grow substantially in the coming years.

This report examines education. It is fair to admit that academia cannot be made responsible for changing society. It is necessary to recognize that lack of progress in other areas of society affects progress, or the lack of it, at colleges and universities and that the reverse of that statement also is true.

This study should contribute some basis for comparing periods and establishing trends. It suggests the attitudes which black graduates will take with them into wider society. With greater numbers of blacks at highly selective colleges assuming membership in black organizations than those at less prestigious institutions, it would be wise for whites to anticipate and accept racial consciousness among black professionals. Understanding the small and shrinking separatist feeling among blacks would help whites accept black racial affirmation without fear.

The question of class versus racial identity is of great interest to students of politics, sociology, and psychology as well as black journalists. Blacks attaining high educational and economic status in the near future will continue to represent only a tiny portion of the total population or of the black population. On the other hand, they are a large percentage of potential black leaders. If their allegiance is to class alone, whom does this leave to identify and articulate needs and strengths in the black community? Who will organize, lead, and lend support to projects, activities, and institutions which benefit the black community?

It may be time to employ Jewel Gibbs' framework to challenge the notion of class in America. Perhaps racial identity can no longer be considered a strong determinant of class. In the past blacks and whites probably considered that membership in the black race determined lower status, although whites could belong to any class. Distinctions among blacks along class lines were real and were based on education, income and family, but not on social position in the white-dominated larger society. Now that

blacks do succeed, relative to whites as well as relative to each other, opportunity for membership in larger class structures becomes reality. If, however, as Ms. Gibbs suggests and as this study confirms, educated middle-class blacks affirm their racial identity, the elite would appear to have strong ties to a majority of blacks of other classes.

The findings of this study have important implications for anyone involved with the education of black undergraduates in predominantly white colleges. The study sheds light on two basic types of questions. First, how can larger numbers of black students be enrolled in predominantly white institutions which are appropriate for them? And second, how can the benefits of such enrollment be maximized?

Clearly, in the short run, black enrollment will increase only if special recruitment efforts are made. Less clear is exactly which efforts are fruitful and deserve emphasis. Frequently the success or failure of a recruitment program has depended on the personal qualities of one black member of the college's admissions staff whose responsibility is minority recruitment. This approach has several pitfalls:

1) Because such an assignment offers few possibilities for career development, it is difficult to attract or to hold for more than a year or two people with the requisite personal qualities.

2) Inadequate emphasis on strategy and tactics including full use of the institution's regular recruitment network often undermines or weakens the effectiveness of even the best recruiter.

3) As time passes, this approach conveys an increasingly inappropriate separateness about the status of blacks at the institution.

It is time for institutions which have tens and even hundreds of volunteers involved in recruiting and assisting applicants to use part of all of those resources for minority recruitment. If one person and possibly a handful of black alumni are responsible for black recruitment it is clear that the institution has a quite limited (though possibly very real) commitment to encourage black enrollment.

As other resource people are involved they must be trained to avoid a separate and sometimes contradictory

"pitch" to black candidates than the one for white students. For example, the physical setting of some rural colleges is treated as a cause for an apology to black students but as one of the institution's most attractive features for white students. In addition, often it is the case that black candidates are sought almost exclusively in feeder schools which are different from those which consistently produce white candidates, an approach that is more and more inappropriate as desegregation of all types of secondary schools proceeds.

As is the case with white students, the critical factor in recruitment over the long run is the record of similar students who previously attended the institution. For this and many other obvious reasons, emphasis must be placed on what happens to black students after they enroll. Since the first experience of these students when they arrive on campus often is a separate orientation for black students, it is ironic that there is so much anxiety about the alleged tendency to maintain separate patterns of activity as undergraduates. In other words, colleges must provide a model of what they want -- separate recruitment, orientation, assignment of black roommates for freshmen year, activities budgets, etc. are hardly inducements for black students to consider themselves regular members of a college community. The structural patterns established and endorsed by an institution send a message to black students, and that message too often has been, "we are not sure you will fit in here."

Recommendations which are presented in this report should be understood in that context. Prophecies about the lack of interest of black students in an institution or about their lack of interest in becoming fully involved in the institution are likely to become at least partially self-fulfilling. More and more colleges fortunately are realizing that policies developed in the 1960's to deal with a new set of circumstances probably need revision for the 1980's.

Although state and national policies are outside the scope of this study, the same logic can and should be applied to them. The emphasis of these policies and the messages they convey both to institutions and to black students deserve reconsideration.

Black students and adults need to see clear indications that they are welcome at white colleges. They also need to see that there is commitment to changing historical reality so that "'predominantly white' ceases to imply dominated by whites'".[6]

Chapter V: Notes

1) Peterson et al., 1978, pp. 145 and 136.
2) Ibid., p. 206.
3) Ibid., esp. pp. 144 and 191.
4) Ibid., p. 207.
5) Boyd, Desegregating America's Colleges, 1974, p. 68.
6) Gallagher, 1971, p. 18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, R.A., and P.O. Snyder, eds. The Minority Student on the Campus. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1970.

Astin, Alexander W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Atkins, Glen, ed. "The Impact of the Black Experience in Higher Education in New England." An Occasional Paper of the School of Education, University of Connecticut, 1969-70.

Babbit, Charles, and Harold Burbach. "Perceptions of Social Control Among Black College Students," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 48 (1979).

Ballard, Allen B. The Education of Black Folk. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Bayer, Alan. The Black College Freshman: Characteristics and Recent Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972.

Bowles, Frank, and Frank DeCosta. Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Boyd, William M. Desegregating America's Colleges: A Nationwide Survey of Black Students, 1972-73. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

_____. "SATs and Minorities: The Dangers of Underprediction," Change, November 1977.

_____. "Are White Colleges Cooling Black Recruitment," Change, Winter 1973-74.

_____. "Black Student, White College," The College Board Review,Winter 1973-74.

Boyd, William M. "Today's Black Students: A Success Story," Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, May/June 1980.

_____. "The First Equal-Opportunity Decade," Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, May/June 1980.

Bradley, Nolan. "The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities of Tennessee," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 36, No.1 (Winter 1967).

Bressler, Marvin. "White Colleges and Negro Higher Education," Journal of Negro Higher Education, Vol. 36, (Summer 1967).

Burrel, Leon. "Black and White Students' Attitudes Towards White Counselors," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 40, 1971.

Centra, J.A. "Black Students at Predominantly White Colleges," Sociology of Education, Vol. 43 (1970).

Claerbaut, David R. "Black Student Alienation: A Study," Research Association. San Francisco, 1978.

Clarke, Kenneth, and Lawrence Plotkin. The Negro Stud at Integrated Colleges. New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963.

Corson, William R. Promise or Peril: The Black College Student In America. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970.

Davis, Junius, and Borders-Patterson, Anne. "Black Students in Predominantly White North Carolina Colleges and Universities," College Entrance Examination Board, New York: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Davis, Samuel, Loeb, Jane and Robinson, Lehymann. "A Comparison of Characteristics of Negro and White College Freshmen Classmates," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 39 (Fall 1970).

DiCesare, Anthony. "Non-Intellectual Correlates of Black Student Attrition," Journal of College Personnel and Guidance Association, Vol. 13 (1972).

Dillingham, Gerald. "Blacks and the College Experience Revisited," Integration, Vol. 14, No.3, 1976.

Edwards, Harry. Black Students. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Egerton, John. State Universities and Black Americans. Atlanta: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1969.

English, Richard, and Settle, Theodore. "Minority Students in Higher Education," Integration, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1976.

Epps, Edgar. Black Students in White Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles Jones Publishing Co., 1972.

Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in United States Higer Eduction. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Howard University, 1976.

Evans, David L. "Making It, as a Black, at Harvard and Radcliffe," The New York Times, November 24, 1976.

Gaier, Eugene. "Current Attitudes and Socialization Patterns of White and Negro Students Entering College," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 38 (Fall 1969).

Gallagher, Buell, ed. College And The Black Student. New York: NAACP Special Contribution Fund, 1971.

Gibbs, Jewelle Taylor. "Black Students at Integrated Colleges: Problems and Prospects" in Black Brown White Relations in the 1970's. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1977.

_____. "Black Students/White University: Different Expectations," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 51 (1972-73).

Green, Robert. "Minority Group Students at a Predominantly White University," Education, Vol. 92, No.1, (1971-1972).

Harper, Frederick. "Media for Change: Black Students in the White University," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 40 (Summer 1971).

Hedegard, James, and Donald Brown. "Encounters of Some Negro and White Freshmen with a Multiuniversity," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 25 (Summer 1969).

Johnson, Henry. "Black Students at White Colleges," Today's Education, Jan.-Feb. 1975.

Johnson, Thomas A. "Campus Racial Tensions Rise As Black Enrollment Increases," The New York Times, April 4, 1972.

Johnson, Roosevelt, Jr. Black Scholars on Higher Education in the 70's.Columbus, Ohio: ECCA Publication, Inc., 1974.

Jordan, Vernon, Jr. "Blacks and Higher Education--Some Reflections," Daedalus, Vol. 104, No. 1-2 (1975).

Joseph, Gloria J. "Black Students on a Predominantly White Campus," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 32 (Winter 1969).

Kilson, Martin. "The Black Experience at Harvard." The New York Times Magazine, September 2, 1973.

McDaniel, R.R., and McKee, J.W. An Evaluation of Higher Education's Response to Black Students. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1971.

Miller, A.H. "Problems of the Minority Student on the Campus," Liberal Education, Vol. 55 (March 1969).

"The Minority Experience at Predominantly White Universities," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 45 (Summer 1976).

Moore, Gilbert. "The Dot and the Elephant," Change, April 1972.

Napper, George. Blacker Than Thou. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Publishing, 1973.

Peterson, Marvin, Robert Blackburn, Zelda Gamson, Carlos Arce, Roselle Davenport, and James Mingle. Black Students on White Campuses: The Impact of Increased Black Enrollments. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1978.

Pifer, Alan. The Higher Education of Blacks In the U.S. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1973.

Powell, Joann. "Higher Education for the Black Student," Journal of the College Personnel and Guidance Association, 1970.

Ralston, Richard. "An Endangered Species : Black Students at White Universities" in Black Scholars on Higher Education in the 70's. Columbus, Ohio: ECCA Publication, Inc., 1974

Sampel, David. "The Academic Success of Black Students: A Dilemma," Journal of the College Personnel and Guidance Association (1971).

Sedlacek, William. "Black and Other Minority Admission to Large Universities--Three-Year National Trends," Journal of the College Personnel and Guidance Association (1973).

Sowell, Thomas. Black Education: Myths and Tragedies. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1972.

Sowell, Thomas. "Colleges Are Skipping Over Competent Blacks to Admit 'Authentic' Ghetto Types," The New York Times, December 13, 1970.

Vontress, Clemont E. "Counseling Black College Students" in Counseling Negroes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

Wald, Matthew L. "At Brown, Still 2 Communities," The New York Times, November 16, 1975.

Willie, Charles, ed. Black Brown White Relations: Race Relations in the 1970's. New Brunswick, N.J. Transaction Books, 1977.

_____, and Arline Sakuma McCord. Black Students at White Colleges. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

APPENDIX

EPC's study of black undergraduates in white colleges was based on completed interviews at 40 colleges and universities.

During each stage of the study the goal was to interview 20 black undergraduates at each of 40 colleges. The average total achieved was 785. The minor shortfalls were due primarily to actual black enrollment totals in some residential colleges which were lower than those reported, or to difficulty in locating non-residential students on various campuses for interviews.

Selection of the Institutions

The sampling universe covered all four-year colleges and universities in the continental United States with 51 percent or more white enrollment. The institutions were stratified by sponsorship (public or private). Within each of those strata, a second stratification was based on size (smallest total enrollment to largest).* Within each of the resulting strata, a third stratification was based on the percentage of black enrollment (lowest to highest).† Within each of the final strata, the institutions were arrayed by geographic location. Selection of the colleges and universities where interviews were to be conducted was completed by picking randomly within each stratification.

Selection of the Respondents

At each institution quotas were established for a minimum number of respondents from each college year (freshman, sophomore, etc.). In addition, interviewers were instructed to choose randomly within class-year strata or to seek diversity in sex, college major, and extracur- ricular interests if a list of black students could not be obtained.

Lists of colleges selected for each stage of the study and a copy of the 1977 questionnaire follow.

---

* Small: 0-4,999; Medium: 5,000-9,999; Large: 10,000+.
† Low: Up to 2.0%; Medium: 2.1%-4.0%; High: 4.1% and over.

STAGE ONE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Ball State University, Indiana, public
California State University (Hayward), California, public
Campbell College, North Carolina, private
Central Connecticut State College, Connecticut, public
Clarion State College, Pennsylvania, public
Cleveland State University, Ohio, public
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Pennsylvania, private
Drexel University, Pennsylvania, private
Eastern Michigan University, Michigan, public
Furman University, South Carolina, private
Gardner-Webb College, North Carolina, private
Heidelberg College, Ohio, private
Long Island University, New York, public
Newark State College, New Jersey, public
North Adams State College, Massachusetts, public
Ohio State University, Ohio, public
Oregon State University, Oregon, public
Parsons College, New York, private
Rider College, New Jersey, private
Rutgers University, New Jersey, public
Sam Houston State University, Texas, public
St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, public
Southwest Missouri State College, Missouri, public
Tulane University, Los Angeles, private
University of California (Berkeley), California, public
University of Cincinnati, Ohio, public
University of Denver, Colorado, public
University of Detroit, Michigan, public
University of Georgia, public
University of Michigan, public
University of Minnesota, public
University of San Francisco, Calfornia, public
University of South Carolina, public
University of Southern Mississippi, public
University of Texas (Austin), Texas, public
University of Virginia, public
University of Wisconsin, public
Valparaiso University, Indiana, private
Washington University, Missouri, private
William Paterson College, New Jersey, public

STAGE TWO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Albion College, Missouri, private
American International College, Massachusetts, private
Auburn University, Alabama, public
Bradley University, Illinois, private
California State College (Humboldt), California, public
City College of New York, public
College of Wooster, Ohio, private
Eastern Connecticut State College, Connecticut, public
Eastern Washington State College, Washington, public
Edinboro State College, Pennsylvania, public
Emory University, Georgia, private
Gonzaga University/Whitworth College, Washington, private
Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota, private
Harvard University, Massachusetts, private
Henderson State College, Arkansas, public
Ithaca College, New York, private
MacMurrary College, Illinois, private
Marshall University, West Virginia, public
Purdue University, Indiana, public
Sam Houston State University, Texas, public
Samford University, Alabama, private
St. John's University, New York, private
Stanford University, California, private
Tennessee Technical University, Tennessee, public
Trinity College, Connecticut, private
University of Alabama, public
University of California (Davis), California, public
University of Delaware, public
University of Illinois, public
University of Massachusetts (Amherst), Massachusetts, public
University of Minnesota, public
University of Missouri (St. Louis), Missouri, public
University of North Carolina, public
University of Notre Dame, Indiana, private
University of Oregon, public
University of Pennsylvania, public
University of Southern Mississippi, public
University of Wisconsin (River Falls), Wisconsin, public
Wayne State University, Missouri, public
Youngstown State University, Ohio, public

STAGE THREE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Abilene Christian College, Texas, private
California State University (Chico State), California, public
Carleton College, Minnesota, private
Central Connecticut State College, Connecticut, public
Connecticut College, Connecticut, private
David Lipscomb College, Tennessee, private
Drew University, New Jersey, private
Drexel University, Pennsylvania, private
Duke University, North Carolina, private
Eastern Michigan University, Michigan, public
Georgia State University, Georgia, public
Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania, private
Hillsdale College, Michigan, private
Mankato State University, Minnesota, public
Metropolitan State College, Colorado, public
Northeastern University, Massachusetts, private
Northern Illinois University, Illinois, public
Oberlin College, Ohio, private
Occidental College, California, private
Ohio State University, Ohio, public
Oregon State University, Oregon, public
Rockhurst College, Missouri, private
State University of New York (Cortland), New York, public
Tennessee Technological University, Tennessee, public
Texas A & I University, Texas, public
University of Arkansas (Fayetteville), Arkansas, public
University of California (Berkeley), California, public
University of Chicago, Illinois, public
University of Kansas, public
University of Maryland, public
University of Massachusetts (Amherst), Massachusetts, public
University of Nebraska (Lincoln), Nebrska, public
University of Notre Dame, Indiana, private
University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, public
University of Rochester, New York, public
University of Southwestern Louisiana, public
University of Virginia, public
University of Washington, public
University of Wisconsin, public
Virginia Commonwealth University, Virginia, public

SUMMARY OF FREQUENCIES From Stages I-III of ABC's Study of Black Undergraduates

	% of Respondents		
	1973	1975	1977
BACKGROUND			
College & sec. sch./same region	78	75.3	72.4
Parents' income			
less than $5,000	18	11.8	10.5
$5,000-9,999	36	20.0	19.7
$10,000-14,999	25	25.2	17.2
$15,000-24,999	13	18.1	20.4
$25,000 and over	6	8.7	18.5
Didn't know		9.8	
Wouldn't say		5.1	18.5
Parents who attended college			
Both	16	20.8	22.2
Father only	10	9.4	11.6
Mother only	15	16.7	13.7
Neither	59	52.6	52.4
SECONDARY SCHOOL			
Affiliation			
Public		86.1	86.8
Private/Parochial		12.8	12.3
Did not answer			0.9
Racial composition			
0-25% black		31.2	34.1
26-50% black		23.1	25.8
51-75% black		11.2	10.3
76-100% black		33.0	27.7
Didn't know		.8(Didn't answer: 2.0)	
Academic preparation			
Excellent	10	14.0	14.0
Good	38	42.9	41.5
Fair	29	28.2	32.1
Poor	23	14.5	12.0
COLLEGE CHOICE			
Important char. of college			
Academic reputation	48	52.2	64.4
Financial aid	53	42.0	39.2
Proximity	50	38.0	38.2
Low cost	20	19.2	17.2
Get away from home		27.0	32.8

	% of Respondents		
	1973	1975	1977
COLLEGE EXPERIENCE			
Official special admission	50	19.5	21.5
Received academic help	34	36.3	39.2
Major			
Social sciences	17	30.6	25.3
Business	15	15.3	22.1
Education	15	11.1	10.6
Biological sciences	6	10.4	9.5
Engineering & math	4	5.4	6.1
Physical sciences	2	1.7	1.9
Health professions	3	6.1	5.1
English	4	5.6	7.3
Fine arts	4	4.3	2.8
Black studies	1	1.0	0.6
Grades/average			
A	1	.8	.3
A-		1.7	1.7
B+		4.6	5.0
B	25	24.3	17.9
B-		17.5	18.8
C+		22.3	24.5
C	59	18.2	21.7
C-		1.5	2.6
D	7	2.2	.9
Likelihood of dropping out	23	19.6	28.4
Contact w. faculty outside class			
Classwork related only	36	31.2	
Extra projects	17	6.0	
General academic topics	20	11.0	28.6
Jobs/careers	14	5.7	11.7
Social	16	20.1	32.2
More with black faculty	22	7.8	
Little or none	40	46.2	47.3
Overall reaction			
Very satisfied	8	9.4	9.7
Somewhat satisfied	56	63.6	62.8
Dissatisfied	36	26.9	25.8
Negative characteristics			
Kind of place		30.3	19.0
Academic curriculum		18.9	13.2
Size of classes		21.5	18.1
Supportive services		27.3	27.1

	% of Respondents		
	1973	1975	1977
Negative characteristics (cont)			
Percentage black enrollment	60	75.9	77.7
Black fac. & admin. presence	60	80.4	82.9
Access of fac. membs. & admnors.	42	31.1	22.3
Overt attempts at discrim.	61	62.0	68.2
Discrimination victim	49	43.9	50.4
Influence of race			
Dominant	41	27.3	20.3
Significant	27	29.0	33.8
Little	31	43.4	45.5
Current housing			
Interracial dorm	48	60.1	54.4
All-black or minority dorm	4	3.8	2.7
Private off-campus apt.	24	22.9	29.0
Parents' home	18	11.5	9.5
			7 Other: 4.1 /
Preferred housing			
Interracial dorm	20	29.8	23.4
All-black or minority dorm	15	7.6	6.3
Private apt.	46	58.5	61.9
Parents' home	9		4.1
Other		2.7	
Extracurricular activities			
Black organization	47	53.5	48.8
Student government	11	11.7	11.7
Athletics	30	42.7	45.6
Radio, newspaper, etc.	4	6.8	11.1
Tutoring, advising	7	9.8	
Clubs or choir	21	24.8	30.1
None	25	13.0	19.2
POST COLLEGE PLANS			
Graduate school	45	45.5	38.6
Work & grad school	10	19.0	23.8
Work	34	27.8	29.4
Grad degree plan			
M.D.		7.9	7.4
J.D.		13.2	8.6
M.B.A.		6.9	8.2
Other masters		23.2	21.5
Ph.D.		6.5	PhD-EdD: 9.3
D.Ed.		.4	
Non-MD medical		1.9	1.9
D.D.S.		.6	0.4

	% of Respondents		
	1973	1975	1977
FINANCES			
Major source of funds			
Family	20	20.3	20.6
Scholarship from college	29	31.6	30.7
Scholarship from other source	16	12.2	12.5
Loan from college	11	10.3	8.6
Loan from bank	6	3.2	4.6
Loan from other source	3	2.2	1.8
Savings	4	3.3	2.0
Wages	6	4.7	3.4
Vet's benefits	3	2.9	3.6
Concern about money	47	47.1	19.0
Work		45.0	44.2

SELECTIVITY*

BACKGROUND	1973 MS	1973 LS	1975 75sig	1975 HS	1975 LS	1977 77sig	1977 HS	1977 LS
Home Area:			.63			.16		
Large city				64%	62%		71%	66%
Small city				19	22		29	34
Suburban				10	8		--	--
Rural				6	7		--	--
College and Sec. School in Same Region			.00	61	82	.00	64	80
Parents' Income:			.00			.00		
Less than $5,000	10%	20%		9	13		11	14
$5,000-9,999	40	35		14	23		19	28
$10,000-14,999	21	26		28	24		17	24
$15,000-24,999	17	12		25	15		29	23
$25,000 and over	6	6		14	7		24	12
Didn't know/ wouldn't say	--	--		10	17		--	--
Parents who attended College:			.00			.00		
Both	22	14		33	15		33	16
Father only	10	10		11	9		11	12
Mother only	16	15		18	16		16	12
Neither	50	62		38	60		40	60
SECONDARY SCHOOL								
Type:			.00			.00		
Public				79	91		82	91
Private				11	4		18	9
Parochial				10	6		--	--
Racial composition:			.02			.04		
0-25% black				39	28		39	32
26-50% black				20	25		21	30
51-75% black				8	13		10	11
76-100% black				32	34		30	27
Academic Preparation:			.21			.06		
Excellent				--	--		17	12
Good				60	56		41	42
Fair				24	30		28	35
Poor				16	14		14	11

* 1973: more selective/less selective; 1975 & 1977: highly selective/less selective

	MS	LS		HS	LS		HS	LS
COLLEGE CHOICE								
Guidance Received Considered Black College			.01	59	67	.00	63	62
Important Characteristic of College:								
Academic reputation			.00	70	45	.00	80	55
Financial aid			.03	48	40	.00	49	34
Proximity to home			.00	28	42	.29	36	40
Low cost			.00	7	25	.00	8	23
Get away from home			.01	34	24	.27	30	34
COLLEGE EXPERIENCE								
Official Special Admission			.00	31	47	.93	22	21
Received Academic Help			.06	16	16	.11	43	37
Major:			.00			.00		
Social Sciences				33	31		32	22
Business				12	17		14	27
Education				5	14		3	15
Bio. Sciences				18	8		14	7
Engineering & Math				4	6		9	4
Physical Sciences				3	1		4	1
Health Professions				6	6		2	7
English				5	6		10	6
Fine Arts				5	4		2	4
Black Studies				1	1		1	0
Grades/Average:			.00			.00		
A				1	1		1	0
A-				3	1		2	2
B+				9	3		6	5
B				38	21		26	15
B-				18	19		25	17
C+				16	27		23	28
C				12	23		15	28
C-				2	2		2	3
D				0	1		0	0
Contact with Faculty Outside Class:								
Classwork-related only			.14	35	30		--	--
Extra projects			.04	9	5		--	--
General academic topics			.00	17	8	.00	37	23

(cont.)

Jobs/careers	.35	7	5	.74	12	11
Social	.30	23	19	.01	38	28
More with black faculty	.00	12	6		--	--
Little or none	.01	39	49	.01	41	51
Overall Reaction:	.39			.29		
Very satisfied		11	9		11	9
Somewhat satisfied		64	64		66	63
Dissatisfied		25	28		23	28
Negative Characteristics:						
Kind of place	.00	21	35	.00	17	20
Academic curriculum	.00	19	19	.01	12	14
Size of classes	.34	24	21	.03	18	18
Supportive services	.49	27	28	.19	24	29
Percentage black enrollment	.02	82	74	.01	83	75
Black faculty and administrative presence	.12	78	82	.85	83	84
Accessibility of faculty and administration	.00	31	32	.04	20	25
Overt attempts to be responsive to needs of blacks	.00	66	62	.05	73	67
Discrimination Victim	.02	50	41	.33	53	49
Source of Discrimination:						
Faculty members		37	44		53	40
Influence of Race on Choice of Friends and Activities:	.00			.00		
Dominant		37	23		24	18
Significant		27	30		39	31
Little		36	47		37	51
Current Housing:	.00			.00		
Interracial dorm		71	56		66	48
All-black or minority dorm		8	2		5	1
Private off-campus dorm		18	25		18	36
Parents' home		2	16		9	10

Preferred Housing:			.00			.00	
Interracial dorm				38	27	35	16
All-black or minority dorm				8	8	9	5
Private apartment				54	61	49	70
Parents' home				--	--	3	4
Extracurricular Activities:							
Black organization			.07	59	52	.00	58	43
Student government			.12	15	11	.14	14	10
Athletics[1]			.26	46	42	.23	32	28
						.49	17	15
Radio, newspaper, etc.			.00	11	5		16	8
Tutoring, advising			.04	14	8		--	--
None				--	--	.01	14	22
POST-COLLEGE PLANS			.00			.00	
Graduate School				62	38		59	26
Work and Graduate School				14	21		15	29
Work				16	33		20	35
Graduate Degree Plan:			.00			.00	
M.D.				22	8		17	8
J.D.				26	18		22	7
M.B.A.				9	12		8	18
Other master's				25	43		26	42
Ph.D.[2]				10	10		17	14
Ed.D.				1	1		--	--
Non-M.D. medical				3	1		1	5
D.D.S.				2	1		1	0
FINANCES								
Major Source of Funds:			.00			.00	
Family	18	21		22	20		22	20
Scholarship from college	45	24		48	25		39	25
Scholarship from other source (cont.)	11	17		14	12		14	12

1. For 1977 the first figure represents intramural athletics; the second, intercollegiate athletics.
2. For 1977 Ph.D. includes Ed.D.

Loan from college	6	12		5	13		6	10
Loan from bank	6	6		1	4		4	5
Loan from other source	2	3		2	2		2	1
Savings	1	5		2	4		1	2
Wages	5	6		3	5		2	4
Veteran's benefits	2	3		1	4		2	4
Concerned About Money			.22	51	46	.38	21	18
Work			.04	50	43	.00	52	40

Educational Policy Center of A Better Chance, Inc. Spring, 1977

STUDENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

INTERVIEWER:

This interview is part of a nationwide survey being conducted among black students at predominantly white colleges by the Educational Policy Center. The center is a non-profit organization established in 1970 to help colleges provide the best possible experience for black students. In 1974, it merged with A Better Chance, Inc. This survey is the third in a series designed to develop a picture of the life of black students at predominantly white colleges and to use that information to develop policy and program suggestions.

This interview should take approximately 30 minutes. Some of the questions are intentionally open-ended, and I urge you to respond as completely and in as much detail as you desire. Incidentally, your name will not be used in any way in reporting the results of this survey.

1-
2-
3-
4-

_____

_____

Name of Student: _____ C. F. #:
5- 6- 7- 8- 9-

Name of College: _____

College Year: First 10- 1 Second -2 Third -3 Fourth -4

College Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____

College Telephone No.: _____

Permanent Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____

Name of Interviewer: _____

Date of Interview: _____ Time of Interview: _____ to _____

For Office Use Only:

Verified by: _____ Date: _____

Comments: _____

_____

1) Who or what helped you in choosing a college?

1. Teacher/Guidance Counselor/College Advisor at high school
2. Parent/Family Friends
3. College Admissions Officer
4. Other students
5. College literature (catalogs, etc.)
6. Comprehensive guides (Barron's, etc.)
7. No one/Nothing
8. Other: _____

2) How would you rate your academic preparation for college work? Was it:

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

3) Did anything other than classwork help you prepare for college?

1. Unassigned readings; independent studying I did on my own
2. Tutoring or study help
3. Work; jobs I held after school or in summer
4. Special pre-enrollment preparation offered by this college
5. Extra-curricular activities
6. Nothing
7. Other: _____

4) Did you ever consider going to a black college?

1. Yes, I considered it
2. Yes, I previously attended _____
3. No

5) Which three or four characteristics of this college were important in your decision to come here?

1. Reputation/academic standing/curriculum
2. Scholarships/financial assistance
3. Proximity to home
4. Low cost
5. Friends/acquaintances enrolled here
6. Desire to live away from home
7. Other: _____

6) Were you officially admitted under a special program?

1. Yes (Specify) _____
2. No

7) Do you have any worries about paying for your college education?

1. Yes/serious
2. Yes/slight
3. No/none

8A) Do you feel you need special academic help?

1. Yes
2. No

8B) Have you received special academic help from the college's tutoring or remedial services?

1. Yes (Specify type and source) _____
2. No

9A) Is there any chance that you will leave this college before graduation?

1. Yes/Perhaps (GO ON TO QUESTION 9B)
2. No
3. Not Sure (SKIP TO QUESTION 10)

9B) (IF YES) Why do you say that?

1. Transfer
2. Leave of absence
3. Quit school
4. Lack of funds to finance education
5. Other: _____

10) Do you have any contact with the faculty outside of class?

1. Academic
2. Career
3. Social
4. Little/None
5. Other: _____

11A) What is your living arrangement here? (READ LIST)

1. Dormitory that mixes whites and blacks
2. All-black/minority dorm, floor or wing
3. Private off-campus apartment or rooming house
4. Home with parents
5. Other: _____

11B) What living arrangement would you prefer? (READ LIST)

1. Dormitory that mixes whites and blacks
2. All black/minority dorm, floor or wing
3. Private off-campus apartment or rooming house
4. Home with parents
5. Other: _____

12A) Are you currently working?

1. Yes (GO ON TO QUESTIONS 12B & 12C)
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 13)

12B) About how many hours a week do you work?

1. 1-10 hours
2. 11-20 hours
3. 21-40 hours
4. Other: _____

12C) Has working had a positive, neutral or negative effect on you?

1. Positive (Comments):
2. Neutral
3. Negative (Comments):

13) What kinds of extra-curricular activities do you participate in?

1. Black/minority organizations on campus
2. Student government
3. Intercollegiate athletics
4. Intramural athletics
5. Radio station, newspaper, etc.
6. Clubs, choir, etc.
7. None
8. Other: _____

14A) How much does race influence your choice of friends and social activities? Is it: (READ LIST)

1. Dominant factor (GO ON TO QUESTION 14B)
2. Significant influence
3. Little influence (SKIP TO QUESTION 15)

14B) **Why is it a dominant factor?**

15A) **Can black students as a group influence programs and/or policies of this college?**

1. Yes (GO ON TO QUESTION 15B)
2. Don't Know
3. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 16)

15B) What could they do?

1. More recruitment of black students/more minority employment
2. Curriculum changes
3. Development of black student organization/entertainment/cultural activities
4. Other: _____

16) About how much of your free time at school is spent with black students as compared to white students?

1. All with black
2. Mostly with black
3. Mostly with white
4. About half and half

17) How would you describe your overall reaction to thiscollege? (READ LIST)

1. Very Satisfied
2. Somewhat Satisfied
3. Dissatisfied

18) Do you have a positive, neutral or negative feeling about the following characteristics of this school:

Positive	Neutral	Negative		
1	2	3	1.	Kind of place (urban, rural, etc.)
1	2	3	2.	Academic curriculum
1	2	3	3.	Size of classes
1	2	3	4.	Supportive services (counseling, tutoring)
1	2	3	5.	Percentage black enrollment
1	2	3	6.	Black faculty and administrative presence
1	2	3	7.	Accessibility of faculty members and administrators
1	2	3	8.	Overt attempts to be responsive to the needs of blacks

19A) Have you personally experienced any racial discrimination here?

1. Yes (GO ON TO QUESTION 19B)
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 20)

19B) What happened?

20) In general, would you say most of the white students you have met at this college have been:

1. Friendly
2. Unfriendly
3. Indifferent

21A) What are your plans after graduation from college?

1. Graduate school
2. Work and graduate school
3. Work
4. Don't Know
5. Other: _____

21B) (FOR THOSE PLANNING TO ATTEND GRADUATE SCHOOL) What field?

1. Social sciences (history, political science, sociology, anthropology, urban studies, American studies, psychology, area studies)
2. Business (economics, marketing, management, accounting, public administration)
3. Education
4. Biological sciences (zoology, anatomy, botany, pathology)
5. Engineering/Math
6. Physical sciences (physics, chemistry, geology)
7. Health professions (medical technology, nursing, public health)
8. English (journalism, speech, drama)
9. Fine Arts (art history, music, painting)
10. Language/Literature (French, German, Spanish, etc.)
11. Black Studies
12. Law
13. Medicine
14. Dentistry
15. Other (Specify): _____

21C) What type of degree?

1. M. D.
2. Non M. D. Medical
3. J. D.
4. MBA
5. MA/MS/MSW/MAT, etc.
6. PhD/DED
7. DDS
8. Other (Specify): _____

21D) (FOR THOSE PLANNING TO WORK) What do you plan to do?

1. Professional (teacher, engineer, nurse, scientist, professor, etc.)
2. Technical (laboratory technician, photographer, draftsman ...)
3. Managerial or official (armed services officer, store owner, government official, business executive plant manager, etc.)
4. Sales (salesman, agent, broker, advertising representative ...)
5. Don't Know
6. Other (Specify): _____

22) (FOR JUNIORS AND SENIORS ONLY) From what sources have you received help in making post-graduate plans?

1. Professor/College advisor
2. Family
3. Other students
4. None/no one
5. Other (specify): _____

23) Is there anything you would like to see changed to improve black student life here?

1. More recruitment of blacks (students, faculty, etc.)
2. More financial aid, expecially for blacks
3. More remedial programs/tutoring
4. More black activities--social life--cultural events
5. Curriculum changes
6. None/no changes
7. Other

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION

INTERVIEWER:

Now I would like to use the last few minutes of this interview to ask you some short-answer questions about yourself.

D1) Age:

1. 17-18
2. 19-20
3. 21-22
4. 23-26
5. 27-35
6. 36-45
7. Other

D2) Sex (BY OBSERVATION)

1. Male
2. Female

D3A) Between the ages of 5 and 15, did you live predominantly in a:

1. Large city/suburban area (more than 100,000 at that time)
2. Small city/rural area (100,000 or less at that time)

D3B) What state was it in? _____

D4) Did either of your parents go to college, even if they didn't graduate?

1. Both
2. Father only
3. Mother only
4. Neither

D5) Did an older brother or sister of yours go to college before you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No, I have no older brother or sister

D6A) What kind of secondary school did you graduate from?

1. Public
2. Private

D6B) Where was it located?

City/Town: _____

State: _____

D6C) What was the racial composition of the school?

1. Less than 25% black/minority
2. 26-50% black/minority
3. 51-75% black/minority
4. 76-100% black/minority
5. Don't Know

D7) Which of the following ranges best describes your parents' current annual income from all sources?

1. Less than $5,000
2. $5,000 - $9,999
3. $10,000 - $14,999
4. $15,000 - $24,999
5. $25,000 and up
6. Don't know
7. Would not answer

D8) Are you:

1. Single
2. Married

D9) What is your major field of study here?

1. Social sciences (history, political science, sociology, anthropology, urban studies, American studies, psychology)
2. Business (economics, marketing, management, accounting, public administration)

PLEASE TURN OVER AND CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

3. Education

4. Biological sciences (zoology, biology, anatomy, botany, pathology)

5. Engineering/Math

6. Physical sciences (physics, chemistry, geology)

7. Health professions (medical technology, nursing, public health, etc.)

8. English (journalism, speech, drama)

9. Fine Arts (art history, music, painting)

10. Language/Literature (French, Spanish, German, etc.)

11. Black Studies

12. Other (Specify): _____

D10) What is your academic average here? (IF SCHOOL IS NOT ON A LETTER GRADE SYSTEM, ASK) What is a perfect grade average?

_____ of a possible _____

D11A) Have you previously attended another college?

1. Yes (GO ON TO QUESTION D11B)

2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION D12A)

D11B) (IF YES) What type was it?

1. 2 year-public

2. 2 year-private

3. Black college

4. 4 year-white, public

5. 4 year-white, private

D12A) What are the sources of money you use to go to school?

1. Family

2. Scholarship from school

3. Scholarship from other source

4. Loan from school

PLEASE TURN OVER AND CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

5. Loan from bank, credit union

6. Loan from other source

7. Personal savings from summer jobs, pre-college jobs, gifts, etc.

8. Wages from jobs held during college

9. Veterans' Benefits

10. Other: _____

D12B) Which one source provides the largest share?

1. Family

2. Scholarship from school (GO ON TO QUESTION D13)

3. Scholarship from other source

4. Loan from school

5. Loan from bank, credit union

6. Loan from other source

7. Personal savings from summer jobs, pre-college jobs, gifts, etc.

8. Wages from jobs held during college

9. Veterans' Benefits

10. Other: _____

D13) What is your college scholarship based on?

1. Financial need

2. Academic talent

3. Athletic talent

4. Other special talent (specify) _____

Card III

D14) In your opinion, what are the major problems for black students at this college?